



**Office of Education  
Performance Audits**

**PROGRESS REPORT  
FOR  
RANDOLPH COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM**

**DECEMBER 2009**

**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

## INTRODUCTION

- The West Virginia Board of Education Office of Education Performance Audits (OEPA) conducted an announced Education Performance Audit of the Randolph County School District February 25 – 28, 2008. Inclement weather necessitated the audit be extended to March 2008.
- The Education Performance Audit Report was presented to the West Virginia Board of Education May 14, 2008. The State Board requested that Randolph County submit a corrective action plan for the areas identified by the Education Performance Audit Report. The State Board further instructed the OEPA return to the Randolph County School District within 90 days to check the progress of Randolph County in implementing their corrective action plan.
- The OEPA returned to Randolph County October 6 - 10, 2008 to conduct a progress review. The purpose of the review was to examine Randolph County School District's progress in meeting the standards required by State Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies.
- An Education Performance Audit Progress report was presented to the West Virginia Board of Education at the December 2008 meeting. The report established that limited progress had occurred in the Randolph County School District since the initial February and March audits. Furthermore, continuing and additional issues were reported and the school system failed to comply with State Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies.
- In December 2008 the State Board determined that extraordinary circumstances existed in the Randolph County School District and declared a state of emergency and placed the county on Nonapproval status.
- According to W. Va. Code §18-2-E-5(p)(C), the State Board appointed a team of improvement consultants to provide recommendations for correcting the state of emergency and gave Randolph County six months to show progress in correcting the deficiencies before the State Board intervened in the operation of the school system.
- An OEPA Team returned to Randolph County October 20 – 23 to ascertain that the county school system had demonstrated substantial progress in correcting the deficiencies in the December 2008 Education Performance Audit Report. School teams also reviewed Elkins Middle School, Harman Middle/High School, Pickens Elementary /High School, and Tygarts Valley Middle/High School to determine that Randolph County and the schools had corrected deficiencies in the December 2008 report.

This Randolph County Education Performance Audit Report includes initial deficiencies in black print, the October 2008 progress review findings in red print, and the October progress review findings in blue print.

**EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM LIST**

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Dr. Donna Davis, Deputy Director

| <b>NAME</b>             | <b>TITLE</b>                         | <b>COUNTY</b>                           | <b>CATEGORY</b>                                     |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Martha Burke            | Assistant Director                   | Office of Instruction, WVDE             | AYP/Five-Year Strategic Plan/High-Quality Standards |
| Robyn Fitzsimmons       | Director of Personnel                | Marshall County Schools                 | Personnel – Hiring/Licensure/Internship             |
| Shawn Hawkins           | Coordinator, Teacher Quality         | Office of Professional Preparation WVDE | Certification                                       |
| Whitni Kines            | Treasurer/CSBO                       | Barbour County Schools                  | Finance   |
| Chris Derico            | Director of Services                 | Lewis County Schools                    | Policy Implementation/Administration                |
| Bill Elswick & Staff    | Executive Director                   | Office of School Facilities, WVDE       | Facilities  |
| Carroll Staats          | President, County Board of Education | Jackson County Schools                  | Evaluation/Leadership                               |
| Tilden “Skip” Hackworth | County Superintendent                | Mineral County Schools                  | Leadership  |

## COUNTY PERFORMANCE

### ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

This section presents the Annual Performance Measures for Accountability and related student performance data. It also presents the Education Performance Audit Team's findings.

#### 5.1. ACCOUNTABILITY.

##### 5.1.1. Achievement.

##### Adequate Yearly Progress

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) data for the 2006-2007 school year identified that Randolph County did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP). Furthermore, Randolph County failed to achieve AYP for the last five consecutive years. The county has been on corrective action for the past two years. The grade span/assessment and subgroup(s) that did not make AYP are shown in Chart 1. It also shows the percent proficient for each grade span/assessment and subgroup. It should also be noted that Randolph County made AYP for the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup at the elementary and middle levels in both mathematics and reading/language arts and at the high school level in reading/language arts through application of the confidence interval.

Chart 1

| WESTEST                   |                                  |                               |                               |                               |                               |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| SPAN/ASSESSMENT           | SUBGROUP                         | 2009<br>PERCENT<br>PROFICIENT | 2008<br>PERCENT<br>PROFICIENT | 2007<br>PERCENT<br>PROFICIENT | 2006<br>PERCENT<br>PROFICIENT |
| Mathematics – Elementary  | Special Education (SE)           | 38.8%                         | 51.5%                         | 57.1%                         | 53.4%                         |
| Mathematics – Middle      | Special Education (SE)           | 16.7%                         | 37.9%                         | 34.4%                         | 39.4%                         |
| Mathematics – Secondary   | Special Education (SE)           | 20.5%                         | 23.7%                         | 24.4%                         | 27.9%                         |
| * Mathematics – Secondary | Economically Disadvantaged (SES) | 44.2%                         | 58.0%                         |                               |                               |
| Reading – Elementary      | Special Education (SE)           | 22.9%                         | 43.9%                         | 47.4%                         | 46.0%                         |
| Reading – Middle          | Special Education (SE)           | 17.6%                         | 40.0%                         | 38.1%                         | 41.8%                         |
| Reading - Secondary       | Special Education (SE)           | 20.7%                         | 31.6%                         | 29.8%                         | 36.5%                         |

\*2008 Additional AYP deficiency.

The Team noted that when the performance of the subgroups listed in Chart 1 was compared with the previous year (2005-2006) No Child Left Behind (NCLB) county data, both mathematics and reading at the middle and secondary levels of percent proficient decreased in academic performance. The elementary percent proficient increased by 3.7 percent in mathematics and increased by 1.4 percent in reading.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Progress Not Demonstrated**

The Team noted the performance of the special education subgroups listed in Chart 1 when compared with the previous year (2006-2007) No Child Left Behind (NCLB) county data, both mathematics and reading at the elementary and secondary levels decreased in the percent proficient in academic performance.

The elementary mathematics percent proficient decreased 5.6 percentage points and the secondary percent proficient decreased .7 percentage points; however, at the middle school level the percent proficient increased 3.5 percentage points.

The county data for reading decreased at the elementary level by 3.5 percentage points. The middle level percent proficient increased by 1.9 percentage points and the secondary level percent of students at the proficient level increased by 1.8 percentage points.

Randolph continued to fail to achieve AYP for the special education subgroups at all levels in both reading and mathematics in 2007-2008 and the secondary economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup also failed to make AYP. Randolph County did not show a measurable level of progress on the 2008 WESTEST.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October, 2009)**

#### **Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented.**

The Team compared the performance of special education (SE) subgroups listed in Chart 1 from the 2007-2008 WESTEST to the 2008-2009 WESTEST 2, and found that the SE percent proficient decreased at all levels. This decline was noted; however, the 2008 – 2009 results were compared to a new test (WESTEST 2) which was more rigorous than the previous WESTEST.

Randolph County failed to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the SE subgroups. Randolph County was fully implementing the Response to Intervention (RTI) process in schools to address failure to meet AYP in the SE, economically disadvantaged (SES), and the all students (AS) subgroups. The Randolph County School District's Five-Year Strategic Plan provided the following evidence: Goal 1 –

Action Steps 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. The SES scores in mathematics were addressed in the strategic plan in Goal 2 – Action Steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Chart 2 shows the number of Randolph County's schools identified for not achieving adequate yearly progress (AYP) during the last five years.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Randolph County School District did not decrease the number of schools that failed to achieve AYP in 2007-2008.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

Progressing. Randolph County School District decreased the number of schools to two that failed to achieve AYP in 2008-2009.

Chart 2

| <b>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS NOT ACHIEVING AYP</b> |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>                                | <b>Number of Schools</b> |
| 2002-2003                                  | 4                        |
| 2003-2004                                  | 1                        |
| 2004-2005                                  | 1                        |
| 2005-2006                                  | 2                        |
| 2006-2007                                  | 3                        |
| 2007-2008                                  | 3                        |
| 2008-2009                                  | 2                        |

An examination of the achievement gap between subgroups in Randolph County for the 2006-2007 assessment school year revealed a measurable achievement gap between the special education (SE) and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups when compared to the academic performance of the all students (AS) and racial ethnicity/white (W) subgroups (Charts 3-8).

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The progress review examination of the achievement gap between subgroups in Randolph County for the 2007-2008 assessment school year continued to reveal a measurable achievement gap between the special education (SE) and economically disadvantage (SES) subgroups when compared to the academic performance of the all students (AS) and racial ethnicity/white (W) subgroups (Charts 3-8).

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented**

The progress review examination of the achievement gap between subgroups in Randolph County for the 2008-2009 assessment school year continued to reveal a measurable achievement gap between the special education (SE) and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups when compared to the academic performance of the all students (AS) and white (W) subgroups (Charts 3-8). Middle school data indicated that the percentage of middle school SES percent proficient was above the State percent proficient in reading and mathematics.

Charts 3 through 5 provide a comparison of the 2006-2007 Randolph County School District student performance in mathematics to the State percent proficient. Randolph County School District's all students (AS) elementary mathematics score was below the State average by 2.4 percentage points; however, the special education (SE) mathematics score was above the State's average by 2.2 percentage points. Randolph County's middle school mathematics scores were above the state mathematics percent proficient in all subgroups except for the SE subgroup which was below the State average by 2.6 percentage points. At the high school level, all subgroups with the exception of SE fell below the State mathematics averages.

Randolph County School District's elementary level percent proficient in reading/language arts (Chart 6) fell below the 2006-2007 State percent proficient in all subgroups. Randolph County's middle school level percent proficient indicated the all students (AS), racial ethnicity/white (W), and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups were above the State's percent proficient while the special education (SE) subgroup fell below the State by 1.8 percent proficient (Chart 7). Randolph County's high school level percent proficient was above the State percent proficient in all subgroups (Chart 8).

Chart 3

| <b>ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS</b>    |  |   |  |   |  |   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Subgroup</b>                  | <b>2008-2009 District Percent Proficient</b> | <b>2008-2009 State Percent Proficient</b> | <b>2007-2008 District Percent Proficient</b> | <b>2007-2008 State Percent Proficient</b> | <b>2006-2007 District Percent Proficient</b> | <b>2006-2007 State Percent Proficient</b> |
| All Students (AS)                | 63.4%  | 65.4%                                     | 75.6%  | 77.9%                                     | 77.3%  | 79.7%                                     |
| White (W)                        | 62.8%  | 65.7%                                     | 75.6%  | 78.3%                                     | 77.3%  | 80.2%                                     |
| Special Education (SE)           | 38.8%  | 40.9%                                     | 51.5%  | 51.8%                                     | 57.1%  | 54.9%                                     |
| Economically Disadvantaged (SES) | 54.1%  | 56.0%                                     | 68.2%  | 70.8%                                     | 69.3%  | 72.7%                                     |

Chart 4

| MIDDLE MATHEMATICS               |  |   |  |   |  |   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Subgroup                         | 2008-2009<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2008-2009<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2007-2008<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2007-2008<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2006-2007<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2006-2007<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient |
| All Students (AS) %              | 59.2%  | 56.9%                                       | 79.4%  | 76.2%                                       | 76.5%  | 75.4%                                       |
| White (W)                        | 59.3%  | 57.6%                                       | 79.7%  | 76.7%                                       | 76.3%  | 75.9%                                       |
| Special Education (SE)           | 16.7%  | 23.1%                                       | 37.9%  | 37.6%                                       | 34.4%  | 37.0%                                       |
| Economically Disadvantaged (SES) | 47.7%  | 46.4%                                       | 74.7%  | 67.7%                                       | 69.1%  | 66.7%                                       |

Chart 5

| HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS          |  |   |  |   |  |   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Subgroup                         | 2008-2009<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2008-2009<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2007-2008<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2007-2008<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2006-2007<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2006-2007<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient |
| All Students (AS)                | 54.5   | 56.9  | 66.7%  | 68.3%                                       | 67.3%  | 68.5%                                       |
| White (W)                        | 54.6   | 57.5  | 66.9%  | 69.1%                                       | 67.4%  | 69.2%                                       |
| Special Education (SE)           | 20.5   | 21.6  | 23.7%  | 23.1%                                       | 24.4%  | 24.1%                                       |
| Economically Disadvantaged (SES) | 44.2   | 46.0  | 58.0%  | 58.2%                                       | 57.8%  | 58.6%                                       |

Chart 6

| ELEMENTARY READING/LANGUAGE ARTS |  |   |  |   |  |   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Subgroup                         | 2008-2009<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2008-2009<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2007-2008<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2007-2008<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2006-2007<br>District<br>Percent<br>Proficient | 2006-2007<br>State<br>Percent<br>Proficient |
| All Students (AS)                | 61.3%  | 65.5%                                       | 79.3%  | 80.9%                                       | 80.7%  | 81.3%                                       |
| White (W)                        | 61.2%  | 65.9%                                       | 79.1%  | 81.1%                                       | 80.7%  | 81.7%                                       |
| Special Education (SE)           | 22.9%  | 32.8%                                       | 43.9%  | 47.2%                                       | 47.4%  | 48.4%                                       |
| Economically Disadvantaged (SES) | 52.0%  | 56.1%                                       | 71.5%  | 74.1%                                       | 73.6%  | 74.4%                                       |

Chart 7

| <b>MIDDLE READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b> |  |   |  |   |  |   |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Subgroup</b>                     | <b>2008-2009<br/>District<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2008-2009<br/>State<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2007-2008<br/>District<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2007-2008<br/>State<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2006-2007<br/>District<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2006-2007<br/>State<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> |
| All Students (AS)                   | 70.4%  | 63.2%   | 83.0%  | 81.6%   | 82.6%  | 81.4%   |
| White (W)                           | 70.0%  | 63.5%   | 82.9%  | 81.9%   | 82.4%  | 81.7%   |
| Special Education (SE)              | 17.6%  | 22.6%   | 40.0%  | 40.3%   | 38.1%  | 39.9%   |
| Economically Disadvantaged (SES)    | 60.4%  | 52.8%   | 76.1%  | 74.1%   | 75.5%  | 73.9%   |

Chart 8

| <b>HIGH SCHOOL READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b> |  |   |  |   |  |   |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Subgroup</b>                          | <b>2008-2009<br/>District<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2008-2009<br/>State<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2007-2008<br/>District<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2007-2008<br/>State<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2006-2007<br/>District<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> | <b>2006-2007<br/>State<br/>Percent<br/>Proficient</b> |
| All Students (AS)                        | 55.0%  | 52.7%   | 76.3%  | 74.4%   | 76.1%  | 75.1%   |
| White (W)                                | 55.3%  | 53.2%   | 76.3%  | 74.9%   | 76.1%  | 75.7%   |
| Special Education (SE)                   | 20.7%  | 14.3%   | 31.6%  | 26.7%   | 29.8%  | 28.1%   |
| Economically Disadvantaged (SES)         | 48.5%  | 41.8%   | 68.3%  | 65.0%   | 69.6%  | 66.0%   |

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Charts 3 through 5 provide a comparison of the 2006-2007 and the 2007-2008 Randolph County School District student performance in mathematics. Randolph County School District's all students (AS) subgroup, elementary mathematics score decreased by 1.7 percentage points; the white (W) subgroup, elementary mathematics score decreased by 1.7 percentage points; the special education (SE) subgroup, mathematics decreased by 5.6 percentage points and the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup, elementary mathematics decreased by 1.1 percentage points. All subgroups were below the State average in elementary mathematics. Randolph County's middle schools continued to increase mathematics percent proficient in all subgroups as reported from the 2007-2008 assessment data reflecting scores above the State mathematics percent proficient in all subgroups. At the high school level, all subgroups fell below the State mathematics averages and continued to decline in the 2007-2008 assessment data, with the exception of the special education (SE) subgroup where a .6 percent increase was revealed. The Randolph County high schools all students (AS) subgroup declined .6 percentage points; the white (W) subgroup declined .5 percentage points and the special education (SE) subgroup declined .7 percentage points.

Randolph County School District's elementary level percent proficient in reading/language arts (Chart 6) fell below the 2006-2007 and the 2007-2008 State percent proficient in all subgroups. However, Randolph County's middle school level percent proficient indicated the all students (AS), racial ethnicity/white (W), special education (SE), and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups in 2007-2008 assessments increased from the 2006-2007 and were above the State's percent proficient (Chart 7). Randolph County's high school reading/language arts in 2007-2008 in all subgroups were above the State's level of proficient (Chart 8).

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented**

Charts 3 through 5 provide a comparison of the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 Randolph County School District student performance in mathematics. WESTEST 2 is a different test given in West Virginia. The 2008-2009 WESTEST 2, mathematics elementary level subgroup data revealed the following decline for Randolph County School District subgroups: All students (AS) decreased 12.2 percentage points; white (W) decreased 13.2 percentage points; special education (SE) decreased 12.7 percentage points, and the economically disadvantaged (SES) decreased 14.1 percentage points. All subgroups were below the State average in elementary mathematics.

Randolph County's middle schools decreased on the average of 21 percentage points in the all students (AS), white (W), special education (SE), and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups. The AS subgroup declined 20.2 percentage points, the W subgroup declined 20.4 percentage points, the SE subgroup declined 21.2 percentage points, and the SES subgroup declined 27 percentage points. However, the mathematics percent proficient scores reported from the 2008-2009 assessment data were above the State mathematics percent proficient in all subgroups, except SE which was 6.4 percent points lower.

All subgroups at the high school level fell below the State mathematics percent proficient. The county continued to decline from the 2007 – 2008 to the 2008 - 2009 assessment year by an average of 12 percentage points in each subgroup. The Randolph County High School AS subgroup declined 11.2 percentage points. The W subgroup declined 12.3 percentage points, the SE subgroup declined 13.2 percentage points, and the SES subgroup declined 14 percentage points. All subgroups were below the State average in high school mathematics percent proficient.

Randolph County School District's 2008-2009 elementary level percent proficient in reading/language arts (Chart 6) fell below the 2007-2008 county data and the State 2008-2009 percent proficient in all subgroups. A comparison to the county's 2007 – 2009 data indicated that the Randolph County elementary schools AS subgroup declined 18.0 percentage points, the W subgroup declined 17.9 percentage points, the SE subgroup declined 21.0 percentage points, and the SES subgroup declined 19.5 percentage points. Randolph County was below the State percent proficient by 4 percentage points on the average, except the SE subgroup which was 9.9 percent below the State average.

Randolph County's middle school level reading/language-arts percent proficient indicated the AS, W, SE, and SES subgroups decreased in the 2008-2009 assessment compared to the county's 2007-2008 data. However, the county performed above the State percent proficient by an average of 6.5 percentage points, except the SE subgroup which was below the average by 5 percentage points (Chart 7).

Randolph County's School District's 2008-2009 high school level reading/language arts percent proficient was above the State's percent proficient in all subgroups (Chart 8), but experienced a measurable decline in all subgroups from the 2007-2008 county data.

Concerns existed at all levels with the special education (SE) subgroup in mathematics and reading. To address the failure to meet AYP in the SE and the SES subgroups, Randolph County Schools fully implemented the RTI process in Grades K-12 following Policy 2419 guidelines. Evidence of this was found in the 2009-2010 Five-Year Strategic Plan: Goal 1 Action Steps 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8. Additionally, to improve high school SES and SE subgroups performance in mathematics, as well as all subgroups, the school district implemented project-based mathematics courses for Algebra and Algebra Support at the career and technical center. This included delivering standards

and professional development for standards focused mathematics implementation for all secondary schools. These recommendations were made and executed according to the Improvement Consultant Team's suggestions.

### Writing Assessment

Randolph County School District's Statewide Writing Assessment performance depicted in Chart 9 was below the State percent of students scoring at or above mastery for Grades 4 and 7. Randolph County's grades 4 and 7 student writing scores have been below the State percent of students scoring at or above mastery for the past three years. However, the grade 10 students scored above the State averages in 2005 and 2006 but failed to achieve the State percent of students at or above mastery in 2007 signifying that all three grades tested failed to achieve State averages on the writing assessments. This indicated a need for improvement in writing instruction at all levels.

Chart 9

| <b>WRITING ASSESSMENT RESULTS</b>              |             |             |             |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Percent Of Students At Or Above Mastery</b> |             |             |             |
|  | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> | <b>2007</b> |
| WV Grade 4                                     | 74%         | 75%         | 70%         |
| Randolph Grade 4                               | 67%         | 71%         | 67%         |
| WV Grade 7                                     | 73%         | 75%         | 76%         |
| Randolph Grade 7                               | 72%         | 71%         | 71%         |
| WV Grade 10                                    | 86%         | 79%         | 87%         |
| Randolph Grade 10                              | 90%         | 80%         | 86%         |

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The writing assessment will be given later in the year and enfolded in the WESTEST Reading/LA subgroup. The Team visited eight schools and found that the schools were emphasizing writing. None of the schools had knowledge of a county "adopted research-based writing program" as indicated in the Randolph County School System Improvement Plan submitted to the Office of Education Performance Audits.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented**

The writing assessment was enfolded in the WESTEST 2 and results were not available. The Randolph County School District 2009-2010 Five-Year Strategic Plan: Goal 1 Action Steps 3, 6, and 7 addressed plans to improve student writing performance in Grades 4 and 7.

## SAT/ACT Assessment Results

Chart 10 shows the Randolph County Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and American College Testing (ACT) results. The SAT math mean score decreased from 517 in 2002-2003 to 487 in 2005-2006. The SAT verbal mean score also decreased from 536 to 488 during the time period. The percent of test takers increased from 13.9 percent in 2002-2003 to 18.1 percent in 2005-2006.

ACT trend data exhibited a decrease in the ACT composite score by 0.8 percent from 2002-2003 to 2005-2006. The percentage of students taking the ACT decreased from 63.9 percent in 2002-2003 to 56.4 percent in 2005-2006.

Chart 10

| SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST (SAT) |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Randolph County                | 2002-2003 | 2003-2004 | 2004-2005 | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 |
| SAT Takers (%)                 | 13.9      | 17.6      | 16.3      | 18.1      | 9.9       | 13.9      |
| SAT Math Mean Score            | 517       | 492       | 473       | 487       | 507       | 481       |
| SAT Verbal Mean Score          | 536       | 523       | 498       | 488       | 519       | 509       |
| AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING (ACT) |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| ACT Takers (%)                 | 63.9      | 72.5      | 71.7      | 56.4      | 69.8      | 62.6      |
| ACT Composite                  | 20.6      | 20.6      | 19.7      | 19.8      | 20.7      | 20.5      |

Source: State, County and School Data, 2005-2006 West Virginia Report Cards, West Virginia Department of Education.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Chart 10 shows the Randolph County Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and American College Testing (ACT) results. The percentage of test takers on the SAT decreased and the Math and Verbal Mean Scores increased. The Math Mean Score increased by 20 points and the Verbal Mean Score increased by 31 points.

In 2006-2007 the number of ACT tests takers increased by 13.4 percent and the ACT composite score increased by .9 percentage points.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented**

Chart 10 shows the Randolph County Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and American College Testing (ACT) results. The percentage of test takers on the SAT increased and the Math and Verbal Mean Scores decreased from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008. The Math Mean Score decreased by 26 points and the Verbal Mean Score decreased by 10 points.

The ACT tests takers decreased by 7.2 percent from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008 and the ACT composite score decreased by .2 point.

The decrease in the SAT and ACT college entrance examinations show an urgency for Randolph County's secondary program to increase rigor and expectations of programs of study. It appeared that the assistance from the West Virginia Department of Education System of School Support, reassignment of county curriculum staff, increased higher level course offerings, and high performance expectations will reverse this trend.

Chart 11

| <b>ACT ASSESSMENT RESULTS (SEVEN-YEAR TREND)</b> |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|  | <b>2003</b> | <b>2004</b> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> | <b>2007</b> | <b>2008</b> | <b>2009</b> |
| English WV                                       | 20.3        | 20.6        | 20.5        | 20.8        | 20.8        | 20.8        | 20.8        |
| English Randolph                                 | 20.6        | 20.8        | 20.3        | 20.4        | 21.5        | 20.2        | 20.5        |
| Mathematics WV                                   | 19.2        | 19.4        | 19.3        | 19.6        | 19.5        | 19.5        | 19.6        |
| Mathematics Randolph                             | 18.7        | 19.2        | 19.0        | 19.2        | 20.1        | 19.5        | 19.1        |
| Reading WV                                       | 20.9        | 21.1        | 20.9        | 21.2        | 21.2        | 21.4        | 21.4        |
| Reading Randolph                                 | 21.1        | 21.9        | 20.8        | 20.8        | 22.0        | 21.2        | 20.7        |
| Science WV                                       | 20.3        | 20.3        | 20.4        | 20.5        | 20.5        | 20.5        | 20.5        |
| Science Randolph                                 | 20.4        | 20.8        | 20.1        | 20.3        | 21.1        | 20.4        | 20.4        |
| Composite WV                                     | 20.3        | 20.5        | 20.4        | 20.6        | 20.6        | 20.7        | 20.7        |
| Composite Randolph                               | 20.3        | 20.8        | 20.2        | 20.3        | 21.3        | 20.5        | 20.3        |

Based on Chart 11, Randolph County ACT assessment results showed an increase in all the subjects from 2003 to 2007 and exceeded the State results in 2007. The Team compared the deficiencies noted on ACT EXPLORE and ACT PLAN with the ACT results and found it commendable that Randolph County carefully analyzed the ACT PLAN and EXPLORE results when assisting students prepare for their ACT assessments.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Current data were not available to assess progress.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented**

Based on Chart 11, Randolph County ACT assessment results showed a decrease in all subjects from 2007 to 2008 and were below the State results in 2009. English increased by .3 between 2008 and 2009; however, mathematics decreased by .4 science maintained the same assessment results. The 2009 composite score for Randolph County (20.3) decreased by .2, a significant decrease and, below the State composite (20.7). Randolph County has undertaken substantial improvement reforms of the secondary programs which should positively affect the 2010 ACT assessment results.

### ACT EXPLORE Assessment Results

According to the Grade 8 ACT EXPLORE results in Chart 12, Randolph County students revealed a slight decreasing trend in the English scores from 2004-2007 and scored below the state averages. Math score results are below the state averages every year from 2004-2005 through 2006-2007. Randolph County science scores were higher than the state averages. Overall Randolph County's composite scores on the grade 8 ACT EXPLORE were slightly below (0.2 percent) in 2005 and (0.3 percent) in 2006; while slightly above in 2004 (0.1 percent); therefore, indicating a lack of growth in the ACT EXPLORE assessments results.

Chart 12

| <b>ACT EXPLORE RESULTS</b> |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Grade 8</b>             |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|                            | <b>2004-2005</b> | <b>2005-2006</b> | <b>2006-2007</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> | <b>2008-2009</b> |
| English WV                 | 14.2             | 14.3             | 14.2             | 14.3             | 13.9             |
| English Randolph           | 14.1             | 13.9             | 13.8             | 13.8             | 13.9             |
| Mathematics WV             | 14.2             | 14.5             | 14.5             | 14.7             | 14.3             |
| Mathematics Randolph       | 14.1             | 13.9             | 14.0             | 14.1             | 14.0             |
| Reading WV                 | 13.8             | 13.9             | 13.9             | 13.9             | 13.6             |
| Reading Randolph           | 13.9             | 13.6             | 13.7             | 13.5             | 13.5             |
| Science WV                 | 15.8             | 15.9             | 15.9             | 16.0             | 15.6             |
| Science Randolph           | 16.1             | 16.5             | 16.1             | 16.1             | 16.2             |
| Composite WV               | 14.6             | 14.8             | 14.8             | 14.9             | 14.5             |
| Composite Randolph         | 14.7             | 14.6             | 14.5             | 14.5             | 14.5             |

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

Current data not available to assess progress.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

#### Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented

The Team examined the 2008 – 2009 ACT Explore results and found that English increased .1 and was the same as the State average. The reading score was maintained, but was below the State average by .1. Science was above the State average by .6 and the overall composite for Randolph County was the same as the State composite. The county had plans in place to explain students' individual scores to them and use the results as indicators for future placement in advanced courses.

## ACT PLAN Assessment Results

Based on the 2004-2005 to 2006-2007 Grade 10 ACT PLAN results in Chart 13, Randolph County test takers showed a range in English from 0.3 to 0.2 percentage points above the State average; however, Randolph County's scores in mathematics ranged from 0.3 to 0.4 percent below the State average and in 2004-2005 equaled the State average. Randolph County students taking the ACT PLAN resulted in above State averages in reading from 0.4 percent to 0.1 percent; however, 2006-2007 student results fell below the State average by 0.3 percent. The science subtest results indicated that Randolph County students scored above the State averages from 0.3 percent to 0.1 percent; however, the results fell below the State average by 0.2 percent in 2006-2007. The composite score trend indicated a slight decrease from 2004-2005 to 2006-2007; therefore, the declining scores indicated an area for improvement in the effort to target students taking the American College Test (ACT) entrance examination.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Current data not available to assess progress.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented**

Grade 10 ACT Plan results showed a relatively insignificant difference from the 2004 – 2005 to the 2008 – 2009 assessment. The Team observed that the 2008 – 2009 Randolph County results were comparable to the State results. The county was using the ACT PLAN results to target students taking the American College Test (ACT) entrance examination.

Chart 13

| <b>ACT PLAN RESULTS</b> |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Grade 10</b>         |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|                         | <b>2004-2005</b> | <b>2005-2006</b> | <b>2006-2007</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> | <b>2008-2009</b> |
| English WV              | 16.7             | 16.8             | 16.7             | 16.3             | 16.3             |
| English Randolph        | 17.0             | 16.9             | 16.9             | 16.2             | 16.2             |
| Mathematics WV          | 16.4             | 16.5             | 16.6             | 16.3             | 16.3             |
| Mathematics Randolph    | 16.4             | 16.2             | 16.2             | 15.9             | 16.5             |
| Reading WV              | 16.5             | 16.6             | 16.5             | 16.5             | 15.7             |
| Reading Randolph        | 16.9             | 16.7             | 16.2             | 16.6             | 15.4             |
| Science WV              | 17.7             | 17.8             | 17.7             | 17.5             | 17.1             |
| Science Randolph        | 18.0             | 17.9             | 17.5             | 17.4             | 17.1             |
| Composite WV            | 17.0             | 17.1             | 17.0             | 16.8             | 16.5             |
| Composite Randolph      | 17.2             | 17.1             | 16.8             | 16.6             | 16.5             |

**5.1.2. Participation rate.** A minimum of 95 percent in the current or a two or three year average of all students enrolled in a public school/county school district/state at the time of testing, including students in each subgroup as required by *NCLB* must participate in the statewide assessment WESTEST or the West Virginia Alternate Performance Task Assessment (APTA) in reading/language arts or mathematics. Students with a significant medical emergency may be exempt by appeal from the calculation of participation rate for AYP provided that the county superintendent has proper documentation. (Policy 2340; Policy 2419; Policy 2510)

All schools in Randolph County met the minimum 95 percent of students participating on all required statewide assessments.

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

All schools in Randolph County continued to meet the minimum 95 percent of students participating on all required statewide assessments.

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** All schools in Randolph County continued to meet the minimum 95 percent of students participating on all required statewide assessments.

**5.1.3. Attendance rate (Elementary/Middle).** The student attendance rate for elementary and middle schools is at or above 90 percent or the percentage of students meeting the attendance rate show improvement from the preceding year. The student attendance rate will be adjusted for students excluded as a result of the Productive and Safe Schools Act (W.Va. Code §18A-5-1a) and school bus transportation interruptions (W.Va. 126CSR81), West Virginia Board of Education Policy 4110, *Attendance Policy*, (hereinafter Policy 4110). Additional exclusions include excused student absences, students not in attendance due to disciplinary measures, and absent students for whom the attendance director has pursued judicial remedies to compel attendance to the extent of his or her authority. For the AYP determination, the attendance rate calculation will be used for accountability at the public school/LEA/SEA levels, but will not be calculated for each subgroup. However, for schools/LEAs that use the safe harbor provision to meet AYP for the achievement indicators, the attendance rate standard must be met by the subgroup/s not meeting AYP.

Chart 14A indicated the Randolph County School District attendance rate has remained above the State requirement of 90 percent for the last four reporting years.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The attendance rates at each of the schools continued to be above the State requirement and appeared to be an area of strength for Randolph County Schools.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The attendance rates at each of the schools continued to be above the State requirement and appeared to be an area that is improving 1.0 percent for Randolph County Schools. Plans were in place to assist at-risk students which staff indicated will increase attendance at the same time.

Chart 14A

| ATTENDANCE RATE |                 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Year            | Attendance Rate |
| 2003-2004       | 95.9%           |
| 2004-2005       | 96.8%           |
| 2005-2006       | 94.9%           |
| 2006-2007       | 95.0%           |
| 2007-2008       | 95.4%           |
| 2008-2009       | 96.4%           |

Source: 2008-2009-2007-2008, 2006-2007 and 2005-2006 data from WV Achieves; 2004-2005 and 2003-2004 data provided by Randolph County.

Chart 14B presents the attendance rates for each school in Randolph County as provided by the county.

Chart 14B

| SCHOOLS                       | 2003-2004 | 2004-2005 | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Beverly Elementary            | 95.4%     | 97.9%     | 98.7%     | 98.7%     | 98.9%     | 98.3%     |
| Coalton Elementary            | 96.4%     | 95.4%     | 95.1%     | 94.8%     | 95.6%     | 97.8%     |
| George Ward Elementary        | 93.7%     | 94.2%     | 94%       | 94.2%     | 94.6%     | 97.3%     |
| Harman Elementary/High        | 96.4%     | 95.2%     | 100%      | 95.0%     | 92.73%    | 93.0%     |
| Homestead Elementary          | 96.4%     | 96.1%     | 95.6%     | 97.1%     | 100%      | 100%      |
| Jennings Randolph Elementary. | 99.2%     | 100%      | 95.2%     | 94.5%     | 95.2%     | 98.4%     |
| Midland Elementary            | 100%      | 99.4%     | 97.1%     | 96.4%     | 97.2%     | 97.8%     |
| North Elementary              | 100%      | 94.8%     | 95.8%     | 97.5%     | 95.5%     | 97.6%     |
| Pickens Elementary/High       | 100%      | 100%      | 100%      | 100%      | 96.40%    | 96.9%     |
| Third Ward Elementary         | 95.3%     | 95.6%     | 95.5%     | 95.4%     | 95.4%     | 98.7%     |
| Valley Head Elementary        | 93.4%     | 100%      | 100%      | 97.8%     | 96.5%     | 98.1%     |
| Elkins Middle                 | 92.8%     | 96.4%     | 92.8%     | 92.4%     | 96.0%     | 94.2%     |
| Elkins High                   | 92.8%     | 92.8%     | 96.4%     | 92.8%     | 93.3%     | 95.4%     |
| Tygarts Valley High           | 83.5%     | 92.4%     | 78.7%     | 82.4%     | 95.79%    | 95.6%     |

**5.1.4. Graduation rate.** The student graduation rate is 80 percent or the percentage of students meeting the student graduation rate shows improvement. The graduation rate is calculated according to the high school completer formula recommended by the NCES with the additional condition that graduates include only those students who receive a regular diploma in the standard number of years and does not include students receiving the GED. For the AYP determination, the graduation rate calculation will be used for accountability at the public school/LEA/SEA levels, but will not be calculated for each subgroup. However, for schools/LEAs that use the safe harbor provision to meet AYP for the achievement indicators, the graduation rate standard must be met by the subgroup/s not meeting AYP.

Chart 15A showed that the Randolph County School District graduation rate met the State requirement of 80 percent for the last four reporting years.

Chart 15A

| <b>GRADUATION RATE</b> |                        |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>            | <b>Graduation Rate</b> |
| 2003-2004              | 87.9%                  |
| 2004-2005              | 89.9%                  |
| 2005-2006              | 87.0%                  |
| 2006-2007              | 86.4%                  |
| 2007-2008              | 85.6%                  |
| 2008-2009              | 86.0%                  |

Source: 2008-2009, 2007-2008, 2006-2007 and 2005-2006 data provided by WV Achieves; 2004-2005 and 2003-2004 data provided by Randolph County.

Four year graduate rate trend data for the Randolph County School District's high schools are presented in Chart 15B. Graduation rate data were provided by the county.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Graduation rate data for Randolph County School District's high schools are presented in Chart 15B. The data indicated that all Randolph County high schools met the State minimum for students graduating; however, through an interview with the curriculum director, it was indicated that Tygarts Valley High School is addressing the continuing decline in the graduation rate in their specific strategic plan. Also, through the same interview, the curriculum director indicated that Elkins High School is addressing the causes and effects for the graduation decline in 2007-2008. These strategies were not documented during the Team's visit since the due date for schools' strategic plan submittal was after the visit date. The county was not addressing the declining graduation rate in its Five-Year Strategic Plan as the graduation rate continues to be above the State requirement.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

Compliance. Graduation rate data for Randolph County School District's high schools in Chart 15B indicated that all Randolph County high schools met the State minimum graduation requirement; however, an interview with the curriculum director indicated that Tygarts Valley High School had addressed the graduation rate in their strategic plan. Randolph County Schools was working with their Grade 9 classes to assist students in the transition into high school. All schools, except Harman, increased the graduation rate. The county addressed the declining graduation rate in its Five-Year Strategic Plan. Plans were in place for developmental courses for at-risk students at all high schools. These included: Credit Recovery programs, RTI implementation, and High School 101 courses. These programs were designed to decrease the dropout rates and to increase graduation rates. To provide appropriate career and technical education courses this year (2009-2010), a Family and Consumer Science teacher was teaching first semester at Pickens Elementary/High School and will be teaching second semester at Harman Elementary/High School.

Chart 15B

| <b>SCHOOLS</b>             | <b>2003-2004</b> | <b>2004-2005</b> | <b>2005-2006</b> | <b>2006-2007</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> | <b>2008-2009</b> |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Harman Elementary/High     | 95.0%            | 100.0%           | 95.2%            | 95.5%            | 100.0%           | 92.9%            |
| Tygarts Valley Middle/High | 82.4%            | 78.7%            | 92.4%            | 83.5%            | 82.9%            | 83.3%            |
| Elkins High                | 86.9%            | 88.6%            | 88.5%            | 88.6%            | 85.1%            | 86.6%            |
| Pickens Elementary/High    | 100.0%           | 100.0%           | 100.0%           | 100.0%           | 100.0%           | 100.0%           |

## SECTION II

### HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

#### 7.1. CURRICULUM

**7.1.9. Programs of study.** Programs of study are provided in grades K-12 as listed in Policy 2510 for elementary, middle, and high school levels, including career clusters and majors and an opportunity to examine a system of career clusters in grades 5-8 and to select a career cluster to explore in grades 9 and 10. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)

Chart 16

| NUMBER OF ADVANCED PLACEMENT (AP), HONORS, AND COLLEGE COURSES OFFERED |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| High School  | 2009-2010<br>Number of AP Courses Offered | 2008-2009<br>Number of AP Courses Offered             | 2007-2008<br>Number of AP Courses Offered | 2009-2010<br>Number of Honors Courses Offered | 2008-2009<br>Number of Honors Courses Offered                    | 2007-2008<br>Number of Honors Courses Offered | 2009-2010<br>Number of College Credit Courses Offered | 2008-2009<br>Number of College Credit Courses Offered | 2007-2008<br>Number of College Credit Courses Offered |
| Harman Elementary/High   | 2   | 0<br>The Team noted that Virtual Classes were offered | 0   | 3   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0   |
| Pickens Elementary/High  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0<br>The Team noted that Virtual Classes were offered at Pickens | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   |
| Tygarts Valley Middle/High   | 6   | 0   | 0   | 5   | 0  | 0   | 4   | 2   | 0   |
| Elkins High  | 10  | 5   | 5   | 28  | 21   | 10  | 6   | 6   | 6   |

Chart 16 demonstrated the number of Advanced Placement (AP), honors courses, and college credit courses offered in one of Randolph County's high schools verified through data provided by Elkins High School. However, the Team noted that students in schools in the outlying areas were offered the AP, honors, and college classes through

the concept of a magnet school at Elkins High School. Policy 2510 requires that high schools offer AP classes; however, the Team recognized the challenge with scheduling and the concern for these students that would be transported from their home school.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The Team found that AP was offered at the three outlying high schools; however, no student was enrolled first semester. A disparity in curricula continued to exist between Elkins High School and the three outlying schools. Providing equal education was not addressed as a goal in the Randolph County Five-Year Strategic Plan.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

Compliance. The Team found that AP, college level/dual credit, and honors courses had increased at all secondary schools. The county made a profound attempt to correct the disparity in curricula at the three outlying high schools and provide an equal education to all students in the county. The Team commended the plan that did not include transporting students to other school sites, which would have involved lengthy bus rides and limited the number of classes the students could take. Randolph County incorporated the virtual course program with 615 students enrolled in virtual programs. Randolph County Schools was meeting the requirements of Policy 2510.

Chart 17

| <b>ADVANCED PLACEMENT TEST (APT) (COLLEGE BOARD)</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Randolph County  | 2002-2003 | 2003-2004 | 2004-2005 | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2008-2009 |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)                             | 0.0       | 0.00      | 0.0       | 0.0       | 0.0       | .4        |
| 11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)                             | 0.0       | 0.30      | 0.0       | 0.0       | 0.7       | 6.3       |
| 12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)                             | 1.0       | 7.10      | 8.3       | 0.7       | 9.6       | 5.6       |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher | 0.0       | 0.0       | 0.0       | 0.0       | 0.0       | 100       |
| 11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher | 0.0       | 100.0     | 0.0       | 0.0       | 4.8       | 79        |
| 12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher | 100.0     | 52.60     | 36.4      | 100.0     | 4.6       | 70        |

\*2008-2009; 2006-2007 data provided by Randolph County; 2007-2008 data were not available.

Chart 17 shows the percent of Advanced Placement (AP) test takers and the percent with a score of 3 or higher on the AP examination. The percent of test takers showed a sharp increase from 1.0 percent in 2002-2003 to 7.10 percent in 2003-2004 and increased to 8.3 percent in 2004-2005, then decreased to 0.7 percent in 2005-2006. During the 2005-2006 year, 100 percent of Randolph County’s students taking the AP examination scored 3 or higher.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Progress**

Chart 17 shows the percent of advanced placement (AP) test takers and the percent with a score of 3 or higher on the AP examination. The percent of 2006 – 2007 test takers showed an increase from 0.0 percent for 10<sup>th</sup> graders to .4 percent in 2008-2009, 11<sup>th</sup> graders increased from 0.7 percent to 6.3 percent; however, the 12<sup>th</sup> graders decreased 4 percent. The students scoring 3 or higher on the exam dramatically increased for all grades 10 through 12. The Team commended this increase in students scoring 3 or above on the AP examinations and receiving college credit for the courses.

Chart 18

| <b>ESTIMATED COLLEGE GOING RATE</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                                     | Number of High School Graduates 2005-06 | Number of High School Graduates 2006-07 | Overall College Going Rate Percentage 2005-2006 | Overall College Going Rate Percentage 2006-2007 | Overall College Going Rate Percentage 2007-2008 | Overall College Going Rate Percentage 2008-2009 |
| State                               | 17,441                                  | 17,914                                  | 58.3%   | 57.5%   | 57.3%   | NA  |
| Randolph                            | 261                                     | 172                                     | 60.2%   | 58.7%   | 49.3%   | 65.0%   |

Source: West Virginia College Going Rates By County and High School Fall 2007 2008, West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission and Randolph County Schools.

The high school graduate overall college going rate for Randolph County was 60.2 percent. When compared to the State’s overall college going rate of 58.3 percent, Randolph County was 1.9 percentage points above the State as presented in Chart 18.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Randolph County’s high school college going rate dropped in 2006-2007 by 1.5 percent; however, this percentage continued to reflect a higher percentage rate than the State average percentage rate.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Progressing**

Randolph County's high school graduate college going rate decreased in 2007-2008 by 9.4 percent and the county's college going rate was lower than the State. However, the college going rate for 2009 graduates provided by the individual schools was 65.0 percent, a substantial increase of 15.7 percent. Randolph County curriculum staff indicated that many of the programs provided by local colleges and universities contributed to this increase.

Chart 18A

| <b>WV ESTIMATED COLLEGE GOING RATE<br/>BY RANDOLPH COUNTY SCHOOLS FOR 2007-2009</b> |                                     |  |                                     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>School</b>   | <b># High School Graduates 2007</b> | <b>College Going Rate Percentages 2007</b> | <b># High School Graduates 2009</b> | <b>College Going Rate Percentages 2009</b> |
| Elkins High School  | 193                                 | 64.2%                                      | 181                                 | 81.2%                                      |
| Harman Elementary/High School   | 19                                  | 26.3%                                      | 13                                  | 10%  |
| Pickens Elementary/High School  | 4                                   | 75.0%                                      | 2                                   | 50%  |
| Tygarts Valley Middle/High  | 75                                  | 53.3%                                      | 75                                  | 52%  |

Chart 18A lists the number of high school graduates and college going rate percentages for each high school in Randolph County. College going rate indicated areas for improvement by Randolph County.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Five Year Strategic Plan Implemented**

Chart 18A distinguishes the extreme disparity in the college going rate for Randolph County's secondary schools. Once again, Randolph County and the individual schools must concentrate on this disparity.

Chart 19

| <b>HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENROLLED IN WV PUBLIC COLLEGES<br/>FALL 2005</b> |                                   |                               |                                     |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|   | % in Developmental<br>Mathematics | % in Developmental<br>English | % in Any Developmental<br>Course(s) |
| State   | 30.3%                             | 15.6%                         | 34.1%                               |
| Randolph  | 20.9%                             | 3.3%                          | 23.1%                               |

Chart 19A

| <b>HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENROLLED IN WV PUBLIC COLLEGES DEVELOPMENTAL<br/>COURSES FALL 2008</b> |  |  |  |                                     |                                     |
|---|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|   | <b>1<sup>st</sup> Time<br/>WV<br/>Freshmen</b> | <b>#<br/>Developmental<br/>English</b> | <b>%<br/>Developmental<br/>English</b> | <b>#<br/>Developmental<br/>Math</b> | <b>%<br/>Developmental<br/>Math</b> |
| State Total   | 8,076  | 1,275                                  | 15.79                                  | 2,224                               | 27.55                               |
| Randolph<br>County Total  | 88   | 12                                     | 13.64                                  | 18                                  | 20.45                               |
| Elkins High<br>School   | 66   | 8                                      | 12.12                                  | 14                                  | 21.21                               |
| Harman High<br>School   | 2  | 1                                      | 50                                     | 1                                   | 50                                  |
| Randolph Tech'l<br>Ctr.   | 1  | 1                                      | 100                                    | 1                                   | 100                                 |
| Tygarts Valley<br>High School   | 19   | 2                                      | 10.53                                  | 2                                   | 10.53                               |

Source: First-Time Freshmen, Previous Year WV High School Graduates in Developmental Courses by Type of Course Fall 2008 (census), West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission

Randolph County's percent of students enrolled in West Virginia Public colleges in developmental courses was below the State's percentage of students taking developmental courses (Chart 19). The percent of Randolph County's high school graduates enrolled in Developmental Mathematics in WV public colleges (Fall 2005) was 20.9 percent compared to 30.3 percent for West Virginia. The percent of Randolph County's graduates enrolled in Developmental English at 3.3 percent was measurably lower than the State's percentage at 15.6 percent.

Randolph County also had a 23.1 percent of students enrolled in developmental courses compared to the State average of 34.1 percent.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Information updates were not available at the time of the Team's visit.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

The percent of graduates from Randolph County enrolled in developmental courses (Fall 2008) was lower than the State average. Randolph County continued to perform better than the State in this area.

## **7.2. STUDENT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE.**

**7.2.1. Five-year county and school electronic strategic improvement plans.** An electronic county strategic improvement plan and an electronic school strategic improvement plan are established, implemented, and reviewed annually. Each respective plan shall be a five-year plan that includes the mission and goals of the school or school system to improve student or school system performance or progress. The plan shall be revised annually in each area in which the school or system is below the standard on the annual performance measures.

The Randolph County Five-Year Strategic Plan did an adequate job of analyzing data and identified some areas of need; however, many of the strategies presented were basic requirements of State Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies rather than strategies based on data analysis and identified county needs.

The county Five-Year Strategic Plan was not a guiding plan for the Randolph County School District. On the other hand, the professional development plan was well developed and planned professional development included areas specific to county and school improvement needs. The county plan should have provided the structure and identified needs for the professional development plan

Randolph County School District had not monitored their Five-Year Strategic Plan to assess effectiveness of professional development, programs, or strategies. Central Office staff brought in each school team and used a rubric and reviewed school strategic plans. The schools were using the local school improvement councils (LSICs) and a check sheet to monitor the progress on their plans. However, the central office had not requested for monitoring.

### **Findings.**

- 1. Strategies to increase the percent of students with disabilities achieving proficiency in mathematics and reading/language arts were not adequately addressed in the Randolph County Five-Year Strategic Plan.**
- 2. The implemented professional development and research-based instructional strategies did not adequately address the need to improve mathematics at the high school level.**
- 3. The implemented professional development and research-based instructional strategies did not adequately address the need to improve writing at all grade levels.**
- 4. The Randolph County Central Office had not monitored their Five-Year Strategic Plan to assess its implementation.**

5. **The Randolph County Five-Year Strategic Plan was not a guide for school system improvement.**
6. **Equitable access to Advanced Placement (AP), honors, or college classes was not available to students at all Randolph County High Schools. The number and diversity of these courses also severely limited opportunities for Randolph County School District's students.**
7. **Strategies to increase the percent of students taking Advanced Placement (AP) courses needed to be implemented.**
8. **Career/technical and fine arts offerings were not available at Pickens Elementary/High School.**
9. **Advanced Placement (AP) courses not available at the three secondary schools were not offered by Virtual School.**

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

1. The Randolph County Five-Year Strategic Plan identified areas of need and county goals. However, the Randolph County strategic team identified other deficiencies that were not recognized as priorities such as the dropout rates and the lack of technology in the rural schools. The plan did not use the opportunity as a strategic guide in addressing long term visions and goals for the progress of all student achievement and/or progress with regard to the trend data. The trend data analysis and the recommendations of the OEPA report were not a focus of the long term planning required in a strategic plan.
- 2./3. The professional development plan did not adequately address the long range and embedded practices for change to occur. Also, evaluation practices were not addressed to adequately determine the progress of acquired knowledge. Professional development should be aligned with the specific achievement objectives. The initiatives should be listed by objective or goal rather than a chronological listing. Professional development activities should be focused on specific objectives and not simply a multifaceted approach to a system improvement.
4. The county plan committee should delineate how they intend to meet regularly to review the progress of implementation of the five year plan. These meetings were not documented in their monitoring document and the superintendent presently had not presented the strategic plan to the Randolph County Board of Education members for review and approval.
5. The Office of Education Performance Audits (OEPA) analysis did not include the findings rendered by the OEPA review of Randolph County Schools.

6. The Team continued to recognize a lack of strategic long range planning for the acquisition of technology tools necessary to address the equitable access challenges for career/technical, advanced placement (AP), and college class offerings at the rural outlying schools.
7. The goals, objectives, and actions of the Randolph County School District Five-Year Strategic Plan did not adequately address the declining performance of students with disabilities in mathematics at the elementary and high school level and the declining performance of students with disabilities in reading at the elementary level. Also, the strategic plan did not adequately address the disparity in the achievement gap for students' identified in the economically disadvantaged (SES) mathematics subgroup.
8. The following goals, objectives, and actions are essential components of the Randolph County Five-Year Strategic Plan to be a comprehensive guide for improvement.
  - Goals should derive from the prioritized strategic issues. Only three strategic issues were listed regarding achievement. No issues were listed in reference to the OEPA citations.
  - The achievement goals relating to subgroups of low economically disadvantaged (SES) and special education (SE) should have adequate action steps to address these deficiencies. The professional development plan for these objectives is not the vehicle to indicate what the system wants as a byproduct of the objectives. This byproduct of work on the action steps should be evident in the actions steps or objectives.
  - The special education goal did not list objectives.
  - Title IV should reflect building and facilities goals related to the OEPA findings. Only two goals were stated for the Title IV plan, neither addressed the facilities findings.
  - All objectives must be measurable and have a timeline and a methodology for monitoring the progress for each objective.
  - Specific objectives should address equal opportunities for the offerings of AP, dual credit, and honors courses in all high schools.
  - Career and technical education opportunities should be addressed for Pickens High school.

- Trend data for attendance and graduation rates show a decline over time. Although AYP was met in these areas a goal should be developed to address this looming issue.
- Mentorship of teachers and administrators must be addressed in policy but also as a goal for the system.
- Personnel policy revision and a review cycle should be included as a goal to address OEPA findings.
- The Title II plan should contain a goal for acquiring high quality teachers and retaining them. The Title II budget should reflect allocation of resources for professional development relevant to the stated goals and objectives of the core plan, and Title II plan.

## **SUMMARY**

The Randolph County Five-Year Strategic Plan was identical to the county's Professional Development Plan. While it is essential that the professional development plan align with the county strategic plan, the strategic plan is the core plan and central to all other plans. Consequently, the strategic plan was absent key components to guide the county and schools.

The Team interviewed all five Randolph County Board of Education members who each stated they had not worked on the strategic plan yet, but that it was scheduled to begin.

Principal interviews were mixed, in that two stated the county plan was presented at the first principals' meeting, one stated that he had met and talked to the superintendent about the county plan and the school's plan is related to the county plan, one said a copy was handed to this principal and "there is some correlation between the county and school plan," two principals said that principals were not provided the plan, and one said that principals went to the board office to help put together the county plan. With the lack of consistency and communication, the Team determined that a functioning county Five-Year Strategic Plan was lacking to guide short and long range county improvement.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

### **Compliance.**

1. Randolph County School District's 2009-2010 Five-Year Strategic Plan was based on a long term vision and goals for the county. The major focus of the improvement plan was the correction of the OEPA report findings. Trend data analysis and the OEPA report recommendations guided long term planning required in a strategic plan.

2. Randolph County School District developed and was using a monitoring chart for the strategic plan and evidence showed that the monitoring was being done. Revisions of the e-walk format for principals included Five-Year Plan initiatives and the format had been installed as templates on the principals' computers.
3. The Digital Divide was reviewed and revised to reflect a cycle for upgrading hardware/software and recording upgrades. ARRA funds were used to purchase computers for the schools and provide more computer laboratories.
4. The 2009-2010 Randolph County Schools Professional Development Plan addressed the long range and embedded practices necessary for change to occur. Evaluation practices were addressed to adequately determine the progress of acquired knowledge. Professional development activities were focused on specific objectives and an on-line data base was purchased by the county to monitor professional development to maintain records of the professional development courses, attendance/participation, evaluations of the training, and communicate the progress of professional development to all stakeholders.
5. The 2009-2010 strategic plan revealed evidence of planning for the acquisition of technology tools necessary to address the equitable access challenges for career/technical, advanced placement (AP), and college class offerings at the rural schools.
6. The goals, objectives, and action steps of the Randolph County School District's 2009-2010 Five-Year Strategic Plan addressed the declining performance of students with disabilities in mathematics at the elementary and high school levels and the declining performance of students with disabilities in reading at the elementary level. The strategic plan also addressed the student achievement gap of the economically disadvantaged (SES) mathematics subgroup.
7. Development and implementation of a K-12 science curriculum that meets the requirements of the West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510 had not been developed. The focus of summer 2008-2009 was developing reading and mathematics curriculum maps to achieve AYP. The science program is scheduled to be developed during the summer 2008-2009. The Team determined that this was a practical plan.

## 7.4. REGULATORY AGENCY REVIEWS.

**7.4.1 Regulatory agency reviews.** Determine during on-site reviews and include in reports whether required reviews and inspections have been conducted by the appropriate agencies, including, but not limited to, the State Fire Marshal, the Health Department, the School Building Authority of West Virginia, and the responsible divisions within the West Virginia Department of Education, and whether noted deficiencies have been or are in the process of being corrected. The Office of Education Performance Audits may not conduct a duplicate review or inspection nor mandate more stringent compliance measures. (W.Va. Code §§18-9B-9, 10, 11, 18-4-10, and 18-5A-5; Policy 1224.1; Policy 8100; W.Va. Code §18-5-9; Policy 6200; Section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973 §104.22 and §104.23; Policy 4334; Policy 4336)

### Finance

The following items have been summarized from the June 30, 2006 audited financial statements prepared by Tetrick & Bartlett, PLLC dated March 9, 2007. In the annual financial audit of Randolph County Schools, the independent auditors noted the following conditions.

The auditors issued a qualified opinion on the financial statements for the listed reasons:

1. Financial Statements prepared on the regulatory basis of accounting in accordance with West Virginia Department of Education regulations (Not generally accepted accounting principles).
2. The fixed assets (land, buildings, equipment, etc.) have been included in the financial statements at estimated insurable value instead of the required historical cost or estimated historical cost as required by the West Virginia Department of Education.

The auditors discovered reportable conditions in the internal control structure which could affect the Randolph County Board of Education financial reporting and/or operations. In addition, the auditors indicated the reportable conditions were also considered to be material weaknesses. A material weakness in the internal control structure are items which could not reduce to a relatively low level that risk of misstatements caused by error or fraud that would be material to the financial statements could occur and not be detected in a timely period by employees during the performance of their normal assigned functions.

1. Detailed Fixed Asset Listing with Historical or Estimated Historical Costs

A detailed listing of fixed assets (land, buildings, equipment and vehicles) had been maintained utilizing estimated insurance appraisal values instead of the West Virginia Department of Education required historical or

estimated historical costs. As a result of this weakness, the fixed assets may not be properly safeguarded which increases the risk of loss.

Auditors recommendation: Randolph County Board of Education accumulate information and prepare a detailed listing of fixed assets with historical or estimated historical cost to be accurately reflected in the financial statements. This listing should further be updated at least annually to reflect acquisitions and retirements.

The Office of Education Performance Audit Team reported that the Randolph County Board of Education had made a good faith effort to establish and maintain the fixed assets on the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS) as of June 30, 2007.

The procedures followed included:

- a. Began with last insurance appraisal (four years ago) reviewed the appraisal and removed items that were clearly not fixed assets such as library books. In addition, individual items recorded at less than the fixed assets cut off of \$5000 were removed.
- b. Transaction reports were generated through the WVEIS accounting system to determine asset purchases during the last four years. From these reports, the actual invoices were pulled to determine if items purchased met the individual accounting threshold of \$5000.
- c. Bus and other vehicle titles are maintained in the safe. These titles were pulled and invoices and/or other documentation was found to establish historical or estimated historical cost.
- d. Randolph County Board of Education attorney assisted in determining what land was owned by the Randolph County Board of Education and assisted in determining the historical or estimated historical cost.

The Randolph County Board of Education anticipates completing additional work on the buildings to verify the carrying amounts on the fixed asset listing.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Progress - Compliance**

#### **1.1 Detailed Fixed Asset Listing with Historical or Estimated Historical Costs**

The Randolph County Board of Education anticipated completing additional work on the buildings to verify the carrying amounts on the fixed asset listing maintained in WVEIS.

Randolph County Board of Education reviewed the carrying values of the buildings to ensure that there were no errors and that the carrying amounts were reasonable.

2. Depository Bonds

The Randolph County Board of Education (Randolph County Board of Education) bank accounts were not entirely covered by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) coverage or securities pledged by the financial institution on behalf of the Board. Therefore, the Randolph County Board of Education bank accounts were not fully insured and collateralized. As a result of the failure to have all bank accounts properly secured, the risk of loss of Randolph County Board of Education funds has not been reduced to a relatively low level as well as the Randolph County Board of Education was not in compliance with West Virginia State Code.

Auditor's recommendation: Ensure that all bank accounts are properly insured and/or collateralized at all times.

|            | <u>Average Bank<br/>Ledger Balance</u> | <u>Collateralized Amount</u> |
|------------|--|------------------------------|
| Oct 2006   | \$6,302,937.57                         | \$ 3,935,745.50              |
| Jan 2007   | 4,462,359.29                           | 3,932,976.00                 |
| April 2007 | 4,969,890.55                           | 4,452,442.00                 |
| May 2007   | 5,047,044.36                           | 4,436,412.00                 |
| June 2007  | 5,055,763.79                           | 4,433,231.50                 |
| Oct 2007   | 7,017,365.08                           | 5,492,771.00                 |
| Jan 2008   | 5,138,332.65                           | 5,063,913.50                 |

Although the bank has increased the amount of collateral for securing the Randolph County Board of Education cash accounts, the collateralization throughout the years 2006-08 has been insufficient for the deposits on hand. This issue appeared to have been remedied in the most recent month (January 2008) since the collateralized balances plus FDIC insurance covered the entire average bank ledger balance.

In addition to the material weaknesses, the auditors noted the following matters:

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

**No Progress**

**1.2 Depository Bonds**

The Randolph County Board of Education (Randolph County Board of Education) bank accounts were not entirely covered by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) coverage or securities pledged by the financial institution on behalf of the Board. As a result, the risk of loss of Randolph County Board of Education funds has not been reduced to a relatively low level as well as the Randolph County Board of Education is not in compliance with West Virginia State Code.

|            | <b><u>Avg. Ledger<br/>Balance</u></b> | <b><u>Amount<br/>Collateralized<br/>and Insured</u></b> | <b><u>Amount<br/>Uninsured</u></b> |
|------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
|            | \$                                    | \$  |                                    |
| Feb 2008   | 5,126,873.29                          | 5,688,580.50  | 100% insured                       |
| March 2008 | 4,748,211.48                          | 5,705,614.00  | 100% insured                       |
| April 2008 | 4,924,725.05                          | 5,694,258.00  | 100% insured                       |
| May 2008   | 5,331,897.87                          | 5,653,162.00  | 100% insured                       |
| June 2008  | 5,749,195.57                          | 5,621,691.00  | \$ 127,504.57                      |
| July 2008  | 5,862,641.64                          | 5,626,590.50  | \$ 236,051.14                      |
| Aug 2008   | 6,331,526.23                          | 5,633,520.50  | \$ 698,005.73                      |

The Treasurer is aware of the issue and has scheduled a meeting with the West Virginia Investment Pool on 10/27/08 to discuss opening an account to alleviate this issue.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The treasurer met with the West Virginia Investment Pool and began utilizing the pool on December 19, 2008 (deposited \$1,000,000) to ensure that all funds were adequately collateralized. In addition, the treasurer also met with Citizens National Bank in December 2008 (as evidenced by written acknowledgment from the bank) and was successful in increasing the amount of collateralization the bank would

provide. The following represents the depository funds and the amount collateralized by month.

| Month          | Average Bank Ledger Balance | Amount Collateralized and/or Insured | Amount Uninsured    |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| November 2008  | \$7,997,637.55              | \$5,611,068.00                       | \$2,386,569.55      |
| December 2008  | \$7,129,715.30              | \$7,236,104.50                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| January 2009   | \$4,757,480.09              | \$7,227,217.50                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| February 2009  | \$3,662,673.39              | \$7,200,316.00                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| March 2009     | \$3,256,765.38              | \$7,195,943.00                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| April 2009     | \$4,040,727.78              | \$7,200,293.00                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| May 2009       | \$4,004,528.72              | \$7,191,519.00                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| June 2009      | \$5,088,750.51              | \$7,153,205.03                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| July 2009      | \$4,224,749.65              | \$8,038,778.73                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| August 2009    | \$3,821,197.08              | \$8,164,408.85                       | <b>100% insured</b> |
| September 2009 | \$4,947,284.56              | \$8,166,875.90                       | <b>100% insured</b> |

The information listed from November 2008 through September 2009 verified the treasurer had taken measures to ensure that all funds were adequately collateralized and insured. At first glance one may be concerned with a \$2,000,000 decrease in the average bank ledger balance between August 2008 and August 2009. This was easily explained by the \$1,000,000 investment into the West Virginia Investment Pool and the additional \$1.4 M spent during the time period for costs associated with the renovation of Elkins Middle School.

### 3. Purchasing Policies for Child Nutrition Department

No documentation was available to ensure that the Child Nutrition Department's beverage and snack contracts were competitively bid and approved by the Randolph County Board of Education as required. Policy 8200, *Purchasing and Procedures Manual for Local Educational Agencies*, (12-202-29.2) states in part, "All contracts must be approved and signed by the county board or the superintendent, if approval authority has been delegated to the superintendent."

Auditor's recommendation: Necessary steps should be taken to ensure that all contracts are competitively bid and that all contracts are approved by the county board of education or the county superintendent.

The Office of Education Performance Audit Team reported that the Randolph County Board of Education properly solicited competitive bids for their beverage and snack contracts for the FY 2007 school year. The bid summary and recommendation were taken before the Randolph County

Board of Education on August 7, 2006. The contracts were unanimously approved.

However, for the FY 2008 school year, currently in progress, the contracts were verbally extended without official action by the Randolph County Board of Education or county superintendent. Such renewals should be approved by the Board in the future.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Compliance**

#### **1.3 Purchasing Policies for Child Nutrition Department**

Previously, no documentation was available to ensure that the Child Nutrition Department's beverage and snack contracts were competitively bid and approved by the Randolph County Board of Education as required. Policy 8200, *Purchasing and Procedures Manual for Local Educational Agencies*, state in part, "All contracts must be approved and signed by the county board or superintendent, if approval authority has been delegated to the superintendent."

The beverage and snack contracts appeared to have been competitively bid and the selected vendor/contract was approved by the board during their 7/21/08 board meeting.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

### **Continued Compliance**

According to information reviewed, beverage and snack contracts were competitively bid and the selected vendor/contract was approved by the Randolph County Board of Education during their August 6, 2009 meeting.

#### **4. Publishing Annual Financial Statement**

Annual financial statements were not published within the required 90 days in accordance with W.Va. Code §18-9-3.

Auditors' recommendation: Randolph County Board of Education take necessary steps to ensure that the annual financial statements are published within 90 days after the end of the fiscal year.

The Office of Education Performance Audit Team reported that the June 30, 2007 financial statement was published in the newspaper in January 2008. This is in direct violation of West Virginia Code referenced above.

FY2007 was a transition year, whereby, the accounting methodology was changed to generally accepted accounting principals including the conversion of all accounting data to be compliant with GASB (Governmental Accounting Standards Board) 34.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

**No Progress**

**1.4 Publishing Annual Financial Statement**

Annual financial statements are required to be published within 90 days of fiscal year end in accordance with W. Va. Code §18-9-3. The following represents the statements published within the time frame.

| <b><u>Minimum Required Publication</u></b> | <b><u>Published<br/>9/29/08</u></b> |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| District-wide financial statements         | NO                                  |
| Fund basis financial statements            | YES                                 |
| Reconciliation schedules                   | NO                                  |
| Listing of expenditures exceeding \$250    | YES                                 |

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** Annual financial statements are required to be published within 90 days of fiscal year end in accordance with W. Va. Code §18-9-3. The Team verified that the levy rates for FY 2010 and budget were published within the timelines as established in State Code. The following represents the statements published within the time frame.

| <b><u>Minimum Required Publication</u></b> | <b><u>Published<br/>9/29/09</u></b> |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| District-wide financial statements         | YES                                 |
| Fund basis financial statements            | YES                                 |
| Reconciliation schedules                   | YES                                 |
| Listing of expenditures exceeding \$250    | YES                                 |

.Other financial issues noticed during the Office of Education Performance Audit.

1. The Randolph County Board of Education had no excess levy. It is the intent of the Board to place an excess levy on the ballot in May 2008 to assist with operational and facilities maintenance issues.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

1. **Excess Levy Scheduled for May 2008 Ballot – failed 47 percent. This may be tried at a later date, but not in November 2008.**

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Progress**

It is the intention of the administration to place an excess levy on the ballot in 2010. The exact timing has not been decided.

2. Annually the Board must submit to the West Virginia Department of Education a “Certified List” detailing all personnel employed, position codes, location and funding source. This information along with the “Second Month Enrollment” of students is used in determining the amount of State Aid provided to the school district. Using the state aid formula the funding for personnel is limited by the number of students enrolled at the end of the “Second Month”. Based upon the information supplied by the Office of School Finance on 11/28/2007, the Board will be carrying 3.71 extra Professional Educators and 8.378 extra Service Personnel over and above the state aid formula for the FY2009 school year. The treasurer indicated that the Randolph County Board of Education plans to reduce staffing through attrition (retirements) and or reductions in force (RIF) during this personnel season. The Board is fortunate to receive National Forest Funds approximating \$300,000 annually that could be utilized to offset a few personnel positions.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Progress**

2. **Personnel Over and Above the State Public School Support funded positions.**

At the last review it was noted that the Randolph County Board of Education would be carrying 3.71 additional Professional Educators and 8.378 additional Service Personnel over and above the state aid formula for the FY 2009 school year.

Randolph County Board of Education intended on addressing this issue through retirements and attrition. The Board extended the early retirement notification bonus to service personnel to encourage retirements in this classification.

Based on discussions with the Treasurer, the following actions were taken by the Board during the "Personnel Season".

Service Personnel: Retirees – 5 ( 4 replaced)

Reduction in Force - 7 instructional aides  
(Hired 2 special education aides back)

Professional Personnel: Retirees - 9 (all replaced)

Reduction in Force – 4 professionals

Based on this scenario, it appears that the service personnel will be approximately two over what the State has funded through the Public School Support Program.

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

### Progress

#### **2. Personnel Over and Above the State Public School Support funded positions.**

During the last review (October 2008), the Team noted that the Randolph County Board of Education would be carrying 2.43 additional Professional Educators and 6.115 additional Service Personnel over and above the state aid formula for the FY 2010 school year.

During the 2009 Reduction In Force (RIF)/Transfer Season the interim superintendent recommended that six professional positions and two service positions be placed on the RIF list. After personnel hearings on March 30, 2009, the board approved that three of the six professional and the two service positions be placed on the RIF list. At a regular board meeting May 4, 2009, one of the professional positions was rescinded.

The Certified List submitted October 21, 2009 indicated the following State aid eligible positions:

|                                 |                |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Professional positions employed | <u>333.835</u> |
| State Aid funded                | 326.000        |
| Step 7 funded                   | <u>3.500</u>   |

|                             |                |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Professional positions over | <u>4.335</u>   |
| Service positions employed  | <u>192.065</u> |
| State Aid funded            | <u>200.698</u> |

The treasurer indicated that the Personnel Department had prepared the certified list and that the professional positions appeared correct, but that there seemed to be an issue with the service personnel numbers.

On October 22, 2009, the treasurer and his staff compared the payroll processed for the October 28, 2009 payroll to the certified list as reported. During this process they discovered that seven service personnel positions had been inadvertently left off of the certified list. The treasurer contacted the West Virginia Department Education which unlocked the file and the appropriate corrections were made.

3. Since credit cards are very susceptible to misuse and abuse the Office of Education Performance Audit Team investigated the authorization and use of credit cards. Randolph County Board of Education utilizes credit cards. All county directors have a credit card. The Randolph County Board of Education has an established written policy. According to the policy, all purchasing policies must be followed including obtaining purchase orders for all charges prior to incurring the cost.

- Credit card charges were initiated in December 2007 without proper purchase orders. Total amount paid with check #73141 on 12/21/07 was \$4,980.78. Total invoices with confirming purchase orders \$389.76 for meals are detailed below:

- Meals were charged in excess of \$25/day which is in excess of Randolph County Board of Education acceptable practice. Charges in question included the following:

|         |           |       |          |  |
|---------|-----------|-------|----------|--|
| 12/3/07 | Tidewater | meals | \$246.60 | -- Invoice not itemized<br>No listing of attendees |
| 12/2/07 | Bennigans | meals | \$143.16 | -- Invoice not itemized<br>No listing of attendees |

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

**Noncompliance**

**3. Usage of Credit Cards**

Randolph County Board of Education directors have a credit card for their use. Randolph County Board of Education has established a written policy that incorporates the State's purchasing policies, including the requirement for obtaining approved purchase orders for all charges prior to incurring the obligation. During the initial visit several confirming purchase orders (purchase orders obtained after the services/goods were invoiced) were noted when a credit card was utilized.

The credit card statements for the period of May – September 2008 were reviewed. The following instances of confirming purchase orders were found during this time frame when either the Wal-Mart or Diner's Club credit card was utilized.

| <u>Confirming Purchase Order</u> | <u>Funding Source</u> | <u>\$ Amount</u> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| <u>WAL-MART CARD:</u>            |                       |                  |
| 20082056                         | Title I               | \$ 15.94         |
| 20082023                         | Title I               | 40.26            |
| 20082254                         | Title I               | 25.58            |
| 20082323                         | General Fund          | 92.22            |
| 20082195                         | GEAR-UP               | 57.88            |
| 20082227                         | Title I               | 326.97           |
| 20090132                         | GEAR-UP               | 804.69           |
| 20090304                         | Title I               | 475.14           |
| 20090342                         | General Fund          | 91.18            |
| 20090421                         | General Fund          | 18.48            |
| 20090419                         | Title I               | 40.97            |
| 20090420                         | Title I               | 183.46           |
| 20090364                         | General Fund          | 184.58           |
| <u>DINER'S CLUB CARD:</u>        |                       |                  |
| 20082212                         | Title I               | 156.80           |
| 20082252                         | Title I               | 50.00            |
| 20082232                         | General Fund          | 237.47           |
| 20082060                         | General Fund          | 20.67            |
| 20082336                         | General Fund          | 461.56           |
| 20082542                         | General Fund          | 30.00            |
| 20082479                         | General Fund          | 30.00            |

|          |                 |          |
|----------|-----------------|----------|
| 20082454 | Title II        | 134.59   |
| 20082558 | Title II        | 118.67   |
| 20090032 | Title II        | 60.91    |
| 20090154 | General Fund    | 36.00    |
| 20090003 | State Spec. Ed. | 1,475.00 |
| 20090383 | General Fund    | 1,166.94 |
| 20090408 | General Fund    | 39.96    |
| 20090395 | General Fund    | 524.62   |
| 20090471 | General Fund    | 807.43   |
| 20090534 | General Fund    | 11.53    |

Total invoices charged on credit cards (May-Sept 2008) with confirming purchase orders \$7,719.50.

The Randolph County Board of Education met and discussed the issues previously discovered and discussed how they were going to address these issues. All Board policies are on line for public view. The treasurer developed purchase order procedures for the district and has posted these procedures on the web site,

<http://boe.rand.k12.wv.us/education/dept/deptinfo.php?sectiondetailid=13289>.

The procedures stipulate that if a purchase is made prior to obtaining an approved purchase order the person making that purchase will be held personally accountable. As an added measure, the treasurer in the next week intends on sending written notification to all vendors stipulating that purchase orders are required for all purchases. In addition, the treasurer will meet with the superintendent and directors and explain that purchase orders are required for all purchases, including the ones made with a credit card. It is the intention of the treasurer to cease the use of credit cards if there is not compliance by December 31, 2008.

W.Va. Board of Education Policy 8200. *Purchasing Policies and Procedures Manual for Local Educational Agencies*, states:

27.3.4. Purchase orders are not required for purchases of commodities and services made through the use of the State's purchase card system or other purchase card system which provides the same level of internal accounting controls as the State's system, but all requirements specified in this section of the policy related to the purchase card program must be followed, including individual transaction limits, monthly transaction limits, and maximum number of transactions.

27.3.5. Limits.

- a. The purchasing card may be used to make payments for goods and designated services that do not exceed the single transaction limit established by the LEA.
- b. The LEA must establish a maximum monthly limit, a maximum transaction limit, a maximum number of daily transactions and a maximum number of monthly transactions for each individual cardholder.

The Randolph County School District credit card system did not comply with West Virginia Board of Education Policy 8200 in that it is neither the State's purchase card system nor other purchase card system which provides the same level of internal accounting controls as the State's system. For example, the Randolph County credit card system fails to have daily transaction limits, monthly transaction limits, or an encumbering system.

The Team noted other items while reviewing credit card payments that will be discussed by the treasurer. These included:

- WV State sales tax has been charged and paid on several lodging, supplies and equipment purchases made via credit card.
- Detailed itemized receipts for meals is absent when paying via credit card
- Detailed itemized receipts for meals is absent when charging meal to hotel room
- Gasoline is being purchased via credit card – it is assumed that the gas is being utilized in a Randolph County Board of Education vehicle; however, no notation is made as to this fact.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Progress.**

The Team reported the following issues.

| <b><u>Confirming Purchase Order</u></b> | <b><u>Funding Source</u></b> | <b><u>\$ Amount</u></b> |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b><u>WAL-MART CARD</u></b><br>20100296 | Local                        | \$72.01                 |

**Consumers Sales Taxes**

Consumer Sales Tax was paid on one purchase made with the Diners' Club credit card 7/27/2009 (invoice reference number 2677476240265) in the amount of \$ 14.73.

### Supporting Documentation for Credit Card Purchase

W. Va. Code §12-3-18 states:

It shall be unlawful for any county court, board of education or the council of a municipal corporation, or other body charged with the administration of the fiscal affairs of any county, school district, independent school district or municipality, to pay any claim for services rendered or materials furnished unless an itemized account therefore is filed by the claimant covering the claim. Such account shall be itemized in detail, and shall show, among other things, the following: If the claim is for services, it shall show the kind of service, the dates when same was performed and the name of the person performing it; if the claim is for material or supplies furnished, the claim shall show in detail the kind of material or supplies, the quantity, dates of delivery and to whom delivered . . . .

At least one credit card purchase (Toshiba.com 9/14/09) did not meet the documentation criteria established in W. Va. Code §12-3-18.

The treasurer developed and disseminated instructions for invoice processing. After discussions he believes he needs to define what qualifies as an invoice.

4. The OEPA Team inquired about the purchasing policies and procedures. The Randolph County Board of Education personnel stated that the State purchasing policies and procedures manual is followed. The Team randomly tested a few vendors paid in December 2007 which revealed that that was not always the case. The following items were noted.

Confirming Purchase Orders:

|           |          |                                      |
|-----------|----------|--------------------------------------|
| #20081698 | Wal-Mart | Title I funds (Wal-Mart credit card) |
| #20081699 | Wal-Mart | Title I funds (Wal-Mart credit card) |

These purchases were made before the purchase orders had been approved.

The Team recommended that the Randolph County Board of Education:

1. Adopt a formal written travel reimbursement policy.
2. Develop procedures to ensure that purchasing policies and procedures are followed for all vendors.
3. Exercise additional care regarding the use of credit cards as established by the written policy #6430.

Based upon the Team's discussions with the Treasurer, the Randolph County Board of Education appears to be taking a proactive approach to improving the

financial accountability of the system; however, it was reported that resistance was forthcoming from some county staff.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

**Progress was made although later than the Randolph County Corrective Action Response indicated it would occur.**

#### **4. Travel Policy**

According to RCBE response to findings a formal written travel reimbursement policy was to be adopted prior to July 1, 2008. This approval occurred on 10/6/08.

#### **New Items**

##### **1. Van purchased \$24,000**

No documentation of the bid process could be located during the onsite review

##### **2. Check Step 7 plan to determine if designated portion used for textbooks.**

During the FY 2008 and 2009 \$250,000 (or 45% and 44% of the total approved Step 7 budget respectively) was budgeted for textbooks. Approximately an additional \$100,000 was budgeted in FY 2008 in the general fund for the purchase of textbooks. However, no additional funds had been budgeted for textbooks in the FY 2009 general fund as of 10/6/08.

While reviewing the Step 7 plan and the "Special Projects Worksheet" report generated through WVEIS for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008, it became apparent that the Step 7 projects had \$235,169.23 "earmarked" or unspent funds as of June 30, 2008. (42.7% of the total Step 7 funds allocated for FY 2008 remained unspent as of 6/30/08 and 45.7% of that allocation remained unspent as of 10/6/08.)

After further investigation, an adjusting journal entry transferring the amount previously coded and expended on textbooks (\$256,098.81) to the general fund was found to have been made during the FY 2008 fiscal year end close out procedures. Step 7 funds were appropriated for textbooks and textbooks were purchased. This transfer had the effect of reducing the general fund balance at June 30, 2008, while at the same time, leaving a large unspent balance in the Step 7 project. This resulted in less general revenue funds being available to provide for other instructional needs. Also,

although not specifically specified in statute, Step 7 funds should be expended or encumbered during the same year in which the funds are allocated.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** The Team verified that “Correct financial procedures” were being followed concerning these issues.

#### **Facilities**

The Education Performance Audit Team visited the schools in Randolph County. A narrative of the Team’s observations follows.

#### **Beverly Elementary School (Grades K- 5)**

|                              |                    |
|------------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Year of Construction</b>  | : 1953, 1976, 1982 |
| <b>Total Square Feet</b>     | : 30,416 Sq. Ft.   |
| <b>Site Acreage</b>          | : 4.2 Acres        |
| <b>% Site In Flood Plain</b> | : 0                |

This facility was constructed in 1953 with additions in 1976 and 1982. The building was not air-conditioned; however, a few classrooms had window units installed. The exterior of the building needed to be cleaned and painted. Water was not adequately being channeled away from the building. The mechanical system had means to introduce outside air, but did not meet current ventilation requirements. Many of the outside air intake covers were damaged. The classroom units did not appear to have been cleaned or serviced for an extended period of time. The rest rooms inside the facility needed to be cleaned and maintained. The multi-purpose room had tables and freezers along the wall, limiting the amount of usable space. The kitchen was small.

The electrical panels in the Music Room were not locked and these boxes were of the older type with exposed wiring and needed to be locked at all times. The principal was instructed of the danger and placed a maintenance request to have the panels locked. An electrical panel in the copy room was missing a safety blank, but students did not utilize this area. The Team instructed the principal of the danger and the principal initiated a maintenance request to resolve the issue.

Stained ceiling tiles were prevalent throughout the facility. The kindergarten room, in particular, had evidence of active heavy water infiltration and the ceiling tiles along the wall in this room were all heavily stained. The piping insulation was also stained and compromised. Both the interior and exterior of Beverly Elementary needed

maintenance. The need existed to upgrade building components to improve the learning environment, build aesthetics, and improve operational efficiencies.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*Randolph County Schools has employed a summer maintenance crew who will clean and paint the outside of Beverly Elementary School. This crew will work with the summer custodian to channel water away from the building. Randolph County Maintenance staff will repair outside air intakes and replace any covers that are damaged. They will service classroom units during the Summer, 2008. Total estimated cost will be \$10,000.00. A service schedule will be established by the Director of Facilities to conduct regular cleaning of these units. A cleaning schedule will be developed by the building principal for regular cleaning of all restrooms. A daily checklist of duties will be completed by each custodian and filed in the Principals office. The Principal will monitor this on a regular basis to ensure clean restrooms at this facility. No increase in cost and it will be implemented for the 2008-09 school year. Currently tables and freezers are stored along the wall in the gym as it must be used as a multipurpose room. The current kitchen at the school is not big enough to store these items and there is no other storage available at the present time. The school system will run a levy call in November which will provide funding to build a new kitchen and cafeteria at Beverly Elementary School. The addition to the building will alleviate these conditions. The cost is estimated at 1.5 million dollars.*

- *Cleaning and painting, drainage issues, and maintenance of intakes will be completed summer 2008.*
- *Restroom cleaning schedule and checklist to begin immediately*
- *School levy will be on the November ballot of 2008*
- *Electrical panel concerns will be addressed immediately. County electrician will conduct an immediate inspection at the facility. Locks will be place on all panel boxes. Safety blanks will be installed where needed.*

*Custodian, with assistance of the maintenance crew, will replace all damaged ceiling tiles and replace piping insulation where needed. This will take place during summer of 2008.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

*The building exterior, and some of the interior, had been painted. The boys' rest room in the Kindergarten wing had been remodeled. The girls' rest room will not be remodeled until the summer months. The boys' rest room remodeling was done by the principal and custodian. The principal indicated the boys' rest room took longer than expected to complete. They ran out of time and did not get the girls' rest room completed prior to school starting. The girls' rest room was not in as bad a shape as the boys'. The principal indicated that the girls' rest room would be completed next summer. The electrical panels in the band room have all been locked and safety blanks were installed.*

The Team observed several stained ceiling tiles in the facility. Several tiles that were stained had been painted with white spray paint. The leaks causing the tiles to stain must be repaired and the tiles should be replaced. The area behind the library needed to have the gutters repaired to properly channel the water away from the building.

**The other issues cited in the March 2008 walkthrough had not been resolved.**

### **Coalton K – 5 School (Grades K-5)**

**Year of Construction** : 1953, 1975, 1976  
**Total Square Feet** : 40,014 Sq. Ft.  
**Site Acreage** : 5.8Acres  
**% Site In Flood Plain** : 0

This facility was constructed in 1953 with additions in 1975 and 1976. Some areas on this site were not well drained. The Art Room lacked the following equipment: Two deep sinks, hot and cold water, mechanical ventilation, a ceramic kiln and blackout areas. The food service area did not have a locker/dressing room. An area was not dedicated for a health services unit. This site is not handicapped accessible. The heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system at this facility did not have outside air capabilities and therefore did not meet the ventilation codes. The exterior wooden surfaces of this structure needed to be painted. Many of the exterior exit doors were badly corroded and needed to be replaced. The exit doors in classrooms 18 and 21 were jammed and could not be opened by smaller students. The motor for the supply air fan in the gymnasium was very noisy due to a bad bearing. Stained ceiling tiles were prevalent throughout the facility. There were several significant water leaks in the hot water heating loop in the Boiler Room.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*The County Maintenance crew will investigate the areas on site that are not well drained and correct the problem during the summer of 2008. Coalton Elementary School does not have an Arts program or certified Art teacher assigned to the school. The school does have an Arts Bank program whereby a local artist works under the supervision of the classroom teacher for approximately 6 weeks. The teacher and artist work with the students in the old Home Economics room whereby the students can work at tables and they have two sinks that can be used during each session. The room is not an Art room.*

*The restroom located off of the kitchen designated for employees will now be designated as a locker/dressing room to be used only by the Food Service Staff by August, 2008.*

*The summer maintenance crew will paint all outside areas of the school that need painted. The stained ceiling tiles will be replaced by the maintenance staff and school custodians. A room will be designated by the Principal for a Health Services unit to be utilized by the school nurse. The county maintenance staff will replace or repair any damaged doors to the facility; will repair the air supply fan in the gymnasium; and repair water leaks in the boiler room in the basement. Estimated cost is \$10,000.*

- *Drainage issues will be addressed Summer 2008*
- *During the month of June 2008 a locker/dressing room will be designated for the food service staff*
- *Outside painting will be completed from June 1, 2008 to June 1, 2009.*
- *Stained ceiling tiles will be replaced Summer, 2008.*
- *A Health Services room will be in place for the 2008-09 school year.*
- *Damaged doors will be replaced or repaired between June 1, 2008 and June 1, 2009.*
- *The air supply fan in the gymnasium will be replaced between June 1, 2008 and June 1, 2009.*
- *The water leaks in the boiler room need to be repaired during Summer, 2008.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Other than the gymnasium unit and the water leaks in the boiler room being repaired, **the original review comments were unresolved.**

There is unrestricted access to all classrooms throughout the main entry doors and many of the exterior doors did not automatically close and latch. Several emergency exit doors were stuck closed and could not be opened by smaller students. Light lens covers were missing in several classrooms and posed a safety issue for students if a lamp were to break. A room had been designated as a health services room, but this room was used part time as a classroom and still did not have the required equipment and furnishings. A small rest room was designated for the exclusive use of food service personnel, but this area still did not have the required equipment and furnishings. The current HVAC units were well past their expected service life, inefficient, and adversely affected the learning environment. Paint on the exterior wooden surfaces of this structure was peeling and needed to be repainted to protect the wood and to improve the aesthetics of the facility.

### **Elkins High School (Grades 9-12)**

|                              |                   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Year of Construction</b>  | : 1994            |
| <b>Total Square Feet</b>     | : 162,300 Sq. Ft. |
| <b>Site Acreage</b>          | : Not Available   |
| <b>% Site In Flood Plain</b> | : 0               |

This facility was built in 1994. The heating and cooling were provided by water source heat pumps. The mechanical system was original to the building and was approaching the end of its expected life. Elevated levels of carbon dioxide were measured during the Team visit. Numerous stained ceiling tiles existed throughout the facility.

**The fire alarm system was inoperable during the visit. Staff indicated the maintenance company was having trouble sourcing repair parts.** The rest rooms needed to be cleaned and painted. Evidence of routine tobacco usage was apparent in the rest rooms. The exterior of the ductwork in the cafeteria needed to be cleaned. The

exterior of the building was heavily stained and efflorescence was present. The need existed to improve the building aesthetics, educational environment, and operational efficiencies.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*Randolph County Director of Facilities and Maintenance staff will monitor the mechanical condition of the heat pumps at the school. Carbon Dioxide levels will be monitored on a regular basis and results will be recorded. The maintenance staff and custodians will replace the stained ceiling tiles. The county electrician will monitor the Fire Alarm System to ensure operational status on a regular basis. A cleaning schedule will be developed by the building Principal for regular cleaning of all restrooms. A daily checklist of duties will be completed by each custodian and filed in the Principal's office. The Principal will monitor this on a regular basis to ensure clean restrooms at this facility. Maintenance crew will paint the restrooms at Elkins High School. Building Principal will develop restroom monitoring schedule to reduce the use of tobacco at this facility. A plan will be developed by the Director of Facilities to deal with the efflorescence problem at this facility. Estimated cost \$4500.*

- *Mechanical monitoring schedule developed immediately and a report filed with the Director of Facilities quarterly.*
- *Carbon Dioxide will be monitored on a regular basis beginning with the Academic year 2008-2009 and a report will be given to the Director of Facilities quarterly.*
- *Replace ceiling tiles Summer, 2008*
- *Fire Alarm System monitored regularly by using a checklist-needs to begin immediately*
- *Restroom cleaning schedule/checklist will begin immediately.*
- *Painting of restrooms will take place during the Summer 2008.*
- *Restroom monitoring schedule developed and implemented beginning with the Academic year 2008-09.*
- *Director of Facilities will prepare a report detailing the corrective action plan for the efflorescence problem at Elkins High School.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

A camera and an intercom system were in place at the front doors and were actively used to limit access to the school. However, doors located around the perimeter of the building were left unlocked for the teachers to have access to the building and for the students to access the cafeteria. The band director painted some of the storage rooms over the summer. The masking tape was still in place and switch covers had not been replaced in these areas. A number of exit signs throughout the facility were burned out. The auditorium had several house lights burned out and emergency lights on the stage were damaged. The mezzanine over the gymnasium houses exercise equipment used by the baseball and softball teams. This equipment had not been cleaned in an extended time.

**Other items cited in the March 2008 walkthrough had not been resolved.**

**Elkins Middle School (Grades 6-8)**

**Year of Construction** : 1954,1970,1976, 1984, 1991  
**Total Square Feet** : 73,070 Sq. Ft.  
**Site Acreage** : 6.0 Acres  
**% Site In Flood Plain** : 0

This facility was constructed in 1954 with additions in 1970, 1976, 1984, and 1991. The majority of the building was not air-conditioned. A few select areas had local air conditioning. Two new boilers had been installed. There was no mechanical ventilation.

**Staff reported ongoing issues with the fire alarm system.** Numerous areas of water infiltration were prevalent; numerous stained ceiling tiles existed throughout the facility. This facility needed a more aggressive housekeeping program. The housekeeping program should include replacing wet and damaged ceiling tiles. The interior of this facility needed to be painted. The interior and exterior of the facility indicated a lack of maintenance. Two portable units housed at the rear of the main facility contained four classrooms. These units were old and needed maintenance. Students must travel to the portables and Room 214 via a walkway that is not covered. A few rooms in the basement of the main facility were small; one room had eight desks and the other had ten desks. Several opportunities existed to improve the building aesthetics, educational environment, and operational efficiencies.

**RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*In April of 2008, Randolph County Schools was awarded 5.3 million dollars from the School Building Authority to install Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning System at Elkins Middle School. In addition, the electrical service will be upgraded to meet NFPA codes and asbestos abatement will occur in the facility. A drop ceiling will be installed to improve the aesthetics of the building. New classroom furniture and lockers will be installed at Elkins Middle School. The interior of the facility will be painted and the use of the modular classrooms will no longer be used for instructional purposes. The building Principal along with the Director of Facilities will develop custodial schedules and checklists that will enhance the overall housekeeping program at Elkins Middle School. Estimated cost is \$5.3 million.*

- *The SBA project will begin June of 2008*
- *The housekeeping schedules will be developed during the summer of 2008.*
- *Discontinue use of modular units as classrooms-June 2008*
- *Painting of facility will be on going beginning June 2008 through June 2009.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The middle school is currently under construction to remove the asbestos tiles and renovate the HVAC system. A review of the facility was not possible at the time of the OEPA Progress Review (October 6-10, 2008).

### **Elkins Third Ward Elementary School (Grades K-5)**

This facility was constructed in 1976 with an addition in 1986. The mechanical equipment was original to the building. The current mechanical system did not provide ventilation to meet current requirements. The mechanical equipment was at the end of its expected life. A few of the fresh air vents on the side of the building were damaged. The sidewalk needed to be sealed to prevent further degradation. The interior of this building had been well maintained with fresh paint throughout. Some of the carpeting was very old, but had been well maintained. The carpet will need to be replaced in the near future. The facility was organized and very clean. The school principal assumed an active role in maintaining the facility. The principal also indicated that the school benefits from an active parent/volunteer group.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*Randolph County Director of Facilities and Maintenance staff will monitor the mechanical condition of the HVAC system quarterly and report needs to be given to the Superintendent. Repair damaged fresh air vents on the outside of the building. The maintenance staff will seal the sidewalk to prevent further deterioration. PTO will replace worn carpet with new carpet and tile. Cost estimate is \$1,000.*

- *Quarterly schedule will be developed by the Director of Facilities during the Summer 2008.*
- *Maintenance staff will replace damaged air vents between June 2008 and June 2009*
- *Carpet/Tile will be replaced during the summer 2008.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

A camera and an intercom system were in place and being used to limit the access to the building. However, the kitchen staff leaves two doors in the back open for airflow. These doors have screen doors in place that are equipped with locks. At the time of the visit these doors were not locked. The carpet in the library is scheduled to be replaced in November. The fresh air vents on the side of the building and the sidewalks had not been repaired.

**George Ward Elementary School (Grades K-5)**

**Year of Construction** : 1976  
**Total Square Feet** : 30,897 Sq. Ft.  
**Site Acreage** : 3 Acres  
**% Site In Flood Plain** : 0

This facility was constructed in 1976. The site area of three acres did not meet the minimum size requirement for elementary school sites and the site was not large enough for future expansion. This site was not located away from undesirable noise and traffic. This site did not have adequate parking for staff and visitors. The teachers' workroom did not have access to communications technology. The food service area did not have locker/dressing rooms. An area was not dedicated for a health services unit; the counselor's office was used for this purpose. No areas were dedicated for an art class. The Music Room was not located away from quiet areas of the building and music storage was not adequate and the room did not have acoustical treatment. The physical education facilities were not located away from quiet areas of the building. The following equipment was not available for the physical education area; Provisions for two or more teaching stations, available seating, and audio devices. Space was not dedicated for a media center.

Lighting levels in Classroom U6 were too low for reading activities. The heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system was 32 years old and in very poor condition. Most classrooms had elevated carbon dioxide levels, indicating poor outside air ventilation. The HVAC system could not meet the current requirements for outside air ventilation. Ceiling tiles throughout the facility were stained. Several energy savings opportunities were needed at this site.

**RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*No Response.*

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The Team reported some improvement on the previous findings. A grant had been awarded to improve the parking capacity. Communications technologies had been added to the teachers' work area. The counselor's office was shared with the health nurse on a scheduled basis. The Music Room was relocated, but the new location is still close to quiet areas. The low lighting issue in the Reading Room is being addressed with the addition of windows. Windows alone will not provide the appropriate and even lighting levels required for a classroom environment. Additional light fixtures will be needed to bring lighting levels up to the desired range in the space. The Team observed unrestricted access through the front doors that allowed access to all classrooms. Poor temperature control and inadequate ventilation continued to be a major issue due to the antiquated HVAC system. Missing light covers and stained ceiling tiles were still

prevalent throughout the facility. The site area of three acres did not meet the minimum size requirement for elementary school sites and the site was not large enough for future expansion. This site was not located away from undesirable noise and traffic. The physical education facilities were not located away from quiet areas of the building. The following equipment was not available for the physical education area: Provisions for two or more teaching stations, available seating, and audio devices. Space was not dedicated for a media center.

### **Harman K – 12 School (Grades K-12)**

**Year of Construction** : 1950, 1970, 1980  
**Total Square Feet** : 30,560 Sq. Ft.  
**Site Acreage** : 4.5 Acres  
**% Site In Flood Plain** : 25

This facility was constructed in 1950 with additions in 1970 and 1980. The site area of 4.5 acres did not meet the minimum size requirement for elementary, middle, or high school sites. This site was not large enough for future expansion or located away from undesirable noise and traffic. This site did not have adequate parking for staff and visitors and was not handicapped accessible. This site did not have a media center; the local library was used for this purpose. The Art Room lacked the following equipment: Two deep sinks, mechanical ventilation, ceramic kiln and blackout areas. The Music Room was not located away from quiet areas of the building. Storage was not adequate in the Vocational/Agricultural shop.

Most classrooms had elevated carbon dioxide levels, indicating poor outside air ventilation. The heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system could not meet the current requirements for outside air ventilation. Thirteen of nineteen attic ventilators were inoperable. Carpeting in Classrooms 6 and 7 were badly worn and wrinkled, posing a tripping hazard. The custodians maintained the Boiler Room in a very clean and neat order.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

- 1. In the summer of 2009, with the help of the PTA, we will design a circle area in front of the school so the buses will be away from the main road with additional parking including handicapped designated areas.*
- 2. The library at Harman School was built there to meet the needs of that school. The librarian holds classes and works with the teachers to have books and research materials to meet their needs. We do not have adequate space for a media center but we will include it in our CEFP.*
- 3. Equipment such as sinks, blackout areas and ceramic kiln will be addressed as funds become available.*
- 4. We will search the building to find a quiet area and move the class if feasible.*

5. *The instructor needs to maintain adequate storage by reorganizing and practicing better housekeeping skills.*
6. *There is no HVAC system at Harman. This will be addressed in the next levy call.*
7. *Attic ventilation systems operate when heat is created and causes them to become functional depending on the amount of heat created in that area.*
8. *Carpet will be removed and tile will be laid down in the Summer of 2008. Estimate cost \$15,000.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The site area of 4.5 acres did not meet the minimum size requirement for elementary, middle, or high school sites. This site was not large enough for future expansion or located away from undesirable noise and traffic. This site did not have adequate parking for staff and visitors and was not handicapped accessible. This site utilized the local library for their Media Center. The library is located on the school property but did not have a covered walkway to the remote facility. The Art Room still lacked the following equipment: Two deep sinks, mechanical ventilation, and ceramic kiln and blackout areas. The location of the Music Room was adjacent to a classroom and the sound from this area adversely affected the learning environment.

The heating, ventilating and air conditioning (HVAC) system at this facility did not provide outside air causing elevated carbon dioxide levels in all areas and adversely affected the learning environment. Most of the attic ventilators were still inoperable. Carpeting in several classrooms was badly worn and wrinkled, posing a tripping hazard. The Team observed unrestricted access through the front entry doors and exterior doors that do not automatically close and latch. The exterior wooden surfaces of this structure needed to be painted to protect the wood and improve the aesthetics of the facility.

### **Homestead Elementary School (Grades K-5)**

|                              |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Year of Construction</b>  | : 1939           |
| <b>Total Square Feet</b>     | : 30,924 Sq. Ft. |
| <b>Site Acreage</b>          | : 19.2 Acres     |
| <b>% Site In Flood Plain</b> | : 0              |

This facility was constructed in 1936. The facility had a newer boiler that was approximately five years old. The plumbing appeared to be original to the building. The building was not air-conditioned and had no means of mechanical ventilation for the classroom spaces. The carpet in several classrooms was near the end of its useful life. Water infiltration was occurring in the Mechanical Room. Some efflorescence existed in the stairwells. These areas needed to be cleaned and painted.

**The second floor of the building was currently not in use by order of the Fire Marshal because the path of egress did not meet current code. Six classrooms were not being utilized on the second floor.**

The Team found the electrical box in the Computer Room unlocked with several safety blanks missing. The Team instructed staff not to use the classroom until the electrical box had safety blanks installed. A follow up visit the following day showed that temporary safety blanks had been installed in the electrical box. Both the interior and exterior of the building needed to be maintained. The need existed to upgrade building components to improve the learning environment, build aesthetics, and improve operational efficiencies.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

1. *Plumbing and air conditioning will be addressed in the November levy.*
2. *A grant has been applied for from the Historical Society for \$700,000 to allow us to upgrade the electricity and begin the process for air conditioning.*
3. *Carpeting will be removed and replaced with tile in the 2008-09 school year.*
4. *The water infiltration will be sealed and efflorescence will be repaired in the summer of 2008.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

New concrete steps had been installed at the end of the building. The interior had been painted. Two small patches of efflorescence in the gym were in the process of being addressed. A significant amount of efflorescence still existed in the gym and will need to be addressed. Some new windows had been installed in the stairwell.

**The remaining items cited in the March 2008 walkthrough had not been completed. Many of these items require substantial investment and are long term projects.**

### **Jennings Randolph Elementary School (Grades K-5)**

|                              |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Year of Construction</b>  | : 1976           |
| <b>Total Square Feet</b>     | : 34,240 Sq. Ft. |
| <b>Site Acreage</b>          | : 3 Acres        |
| <b>% Site In Flood Plain</b> | : 0              |

This facility was constructed in 1976. The mechanical equipment was original to the building. The current mechanical system did not provide ventilation to meet current requirements. The mechanical equipment was at the end of its expected life. A few stained ceiling tiles were apparent due to ongoing roof leaks. The sidewalk needed to be sealed to prevent further degradation. The rest rooms needed to be painted and cleaned.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*The Randolph County Maintenance staff will monitor the mechanical system on a quarterly basis. The summer maintenance crew and the custodian will replace all damage ceiling tiles as well as seal the sidewalks. The summer maintenance crew will paint the restrooms and the building Principal will develop a schedule for regular cleaning. Estimated Cost \$3,000.*

- *Mechanical System will be monitored quarterly starting in June 2008*
- *Ceiling tiles will be replaced during the summer of 2008.*
- *Sidewalks will be sealed June 2008 to June 2009.*
- *Paint restrooms during the Summer 2008.*
- *Custodial restroom checklist will be developed and implemented August 2008.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

*The staff at Jennings Randolph Elementary School painted rooms over the summer. The rest rooms were scheduled to be painted on October 12, 2008 as part of a volunteer civic organization project. **The sidewalks and stained tiles had not been resolved.***

### **Midland Elementary School (Grades K-5)**

|                              |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Year of Construction</b>  | : 1976           |
| <b>Total Square Feet</b>     | : 36,135 Sq. Ft. |
| <b>Site Acreage</b>          | : 10 Acres       |
| <b>% Site In Flood Plain</b> | : 0              |

This facility was constructed in 1976. The mechanical equipment was original to the building. The current mechanical system did not provide ventilation to meet current requirements. The mechanical equipment was at the end of its expected life. A few stained ceiling tiles were apparent due to ongoing roof leaks. Overall the facility appeared clean and well maintained. The interior had new paint in the rest rooms, etc., through the efforts of school administration and volunteers.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*The Randolph County Maintenance staff will monitor the mechanical system on a quarterly basis. The summer maintenance crew and the custodian will replace all damaged ceiling tiles.*

- *Mechanical system will be monitored quarterly starting in June 2008*
- *Ceiling tiles will be replaced during the Summer 2008*
- *Estimated cost \$500.*

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

A number of rooms had broken thermostats. All rest rooms had dripping faucets and running toilets. Stained tiles and missing light covers were prevalent throughout the building. The chiller gate lock was rusted and obviously had not been used in an extended time. The area within the fence had not been kept clear of weeds. The retaining wall was cracked and the headers were loose at the exit doors closest to the chiller. This wall requires repair.

### **North Elementary School (Grades K-5)**

**Year of Construction** : 1976  
**Total Square Feet** : 30,337 Sq. Ft.  
**Site Acreage** : 5 Acres  
**% Site In Flood Plain** : 0

This facility was constructed in 1976. The mechanical equipment was original to the building. The current mechanical system did not provide ventilation to meet current requirements. The exterior of the rooftop equipment was rusty. The sidewalks around the building had a few areas of concern where they were cracked and had not been sealed. A few stained tiles and dirty diffusers were apparent in the building. The need existed to upgrade building components to improve the learning environment, build aesthetics, and improve operational efficiencies.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*The Randolph County Maintenance staff will monitor the mechanical system on a quarterly basis. The summer maintenance crew and the custodian will replace all damage ceiling tiles as well as seal the sidewalks. The summer maintenance crew will paint the restrooms and the building principal will develop a schedule for cleaning. Estimated cost \$2,000.*

- *Mechanical system will be monitored quarterly starting in June 2008*
- *Ceiling tiles will be replaced during the Summer of 2008*
- *Sidewalks will be sealed June 2008 to June 2009*
- *Paint restrooms during summer 2008*
- *Custodial restroom will be developed and implemented August 2008*

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The interior of the building had been partially painted. Two rest rooms had been thoroughly cleaned and repainted. The interior painting and bathroom remodeling were in process. The sidewalks had not been repaired or sealed. Several scuffed, dirty, and damaged ceiling tiles in the building needed to be replaced. A few light covers needed to be replaced. The mechanical system still needed to be addressed. The intercom

system in this building was very old and should be considered for replacement. An access safety security plan was not in place.

**Pickens Elementary/High School (Grades K-12)**

**Year of Construction** : 1976, 1982, 2006  
**Total Square Feet** : Not Available  
**Site Acreage** : 3 Acres  
**% Site In Flood Plain** : 0

This facility was constructed in 1976 with an addition in 1976 and a complete renovation/addition in 2006. The site area of three acres did not meet the minimum size requirement for elementary, middle, or high school sites. There was no room specifically for a counselor's office; the main office area was used for this purpose. The computer laboratory had only a shared printer instead of the required four shared printers or networked printer. A room was not dedicated for K – 12 remedial classes. A room was not dedicated for art. An area was not dedicated for an auditorium or stage; the gymnasium was being used for these purposes. Vocational classrooms were not available at this site. A room was not dedicated for health services; the administrative offices were used for this purpose. The following facilities were not provided: Agricultural Education, Agricultural Mechanics, Marketing Education, Diversified Cooperative, Vocational Health, Home Economics, Vocational Industrial and Technical, Business Education and Technology Education.

**RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*Pickens is a new school that was opened in 2007 which was funded by the SBA and constructed to their specifications. The specific areas and rooms listed in the report were eliminated from the plans due to the economy of scale.*

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The thermostat in the Social Studies Room underneath the gymnasium was inoperable. Some of the exterior doors were dragging. There has been a leak underneath the sink and the drywall patch was secured in place with masking tape. This was poor workmanship. Some stained ceiling tiles were a result of roof leaks or condensation. The rear of the gymnasium was stained. Efflorescence was forming and the paint was beginning to peel loose. A crack under the window in the social studies classroom had been repaired with drywall mud but had not been finished. Significant water intrusion was evident near the rear exit door behind the principal's office. The drywall had been repaired but had never been finished and repainted. This has been in this condition since the March 2008 walkthrough. Several interior light covers were full of bugs. Some of the interior paint was in need of touch up.

**This is a new facility and needed a more aggressive maintenance schedule to maintain the building in new condition.**

**Tygarts Valley Middle/High School (Grades 6-12)**

**Year of Construction** : 1923, 1951, 1976, 1979, 2001  
**Total Square Feet** : 66,050 Sq. Ft.  
**Site Acreage** : 3.5 Acres  
**% Site In Flood Plain** : 0

This facility was constructed in 1923 with additions in 1951, 1976, 1979, and major renovations in 2001. The site area of 3.5 acres did not meet the minimum size requirement for middle or high school sites. The computer laboratory had only one shared printer instead of the required four printers or networked printer. Classrooms 212 and 213 were inadequate in size for the number of students present. The Art Room lacked the following equipment: Mechanical ventilation, ceramic kiln, and blackout areas. The music area did not have acoustical treatment. Science Rooms 201 and 202 were not located with easy access to outdoor activities or isolated to keep odors from the rest of the building. These science rooms lacked the following equipment: DC current, air vacuums, and adequate storage areas. There was no space dedicated to an auditorium, the gymnasium was used for this purpose. The gymnasium did not have the following equipment otherwise required for an auditorium: Acoustical panels, film screens, and distance learning capabilities. The classroom and laboratory space in each vocational area of agricultural education and agricultural mechanics were not adequate to meet curriculum needs.

Several exterior doors at this site did not latch and were not secured. The gymnasium was not handicapped accessible. The middle school was not handicapped accessible. Stained ceiling tiles existed throughout the facility. An excessive number of light lenses were damaged or missing in the middle school area. The damper actuator linkage was slipping on the combustion air damper in the Mechanical Room of the high school. Elevated carbon dioxide levels in several of the classrooms indicated that outside air ventilation was inadequate. Several stairwell and fire doors were propped open.

**RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*Director of Technology will investigate the need for additional printers or a network printer of the computer lab. The Principal and Director of Facilities will adjust the number of students who utilize rooms 212 and 213 in regard to the number of square footage permitted in accordance with code by moving classrooms. Tygarts Valley Middle/High School does not currently have an auditorium as part of the facility complex. A new high school addition was built with SBA funds in 2001 and an auditorium was part of the original plans for the new facility. However, due to a shortage of funds, the auditorium was eliminated from the proposal. The gymnasium is currently used by students and staff for large group activities and presentations. The vocational director and the building principal will conduct a study to determine how to meet the curriculum need of the agricultural education program. Maintenance staff will repair all exit doors. School custodians and maintenance employees will replace stained ceiling tiles and missing light lenses by October of 2008. This will be done after the new roof has been installed.*

*The maintenance staff has already repaired the actuator linkage on the combustion air damper in the mechanical room at the high school. Carbon Dioxide levels will be monitored on a regular basis and results will be recorded. Building administrator will work with the custodians to complete regular walkthroughs to make sure that all doors are secured at all times.*

*The Director of Facilities will conduct a study and cost estimate of the following concerns and provide the Superintendent and Board with a report in regard to:*

- *Adding mechanical ventilation, ceramic kiln, and a blackout area in the current art room including costs involved by January 2009*
- *Application of acoustical treatment to the music room including costs involved by January 2009*
- *Plan for outside ventilation of science rooms 201 and 202*
- *Director of Technology will remedy the printer problem in the computer lab by September 30, 2008.*
- *Classrooms will be rearranged so that the number of students/per square foot will be acceptable per code-August 2008.*
- *Carbon Dioxide will be monitored on a regular basis beginning with the Academic year 2008-09 and a report will be given to the Director of Facilities quarterly.*
- *Schedule monitoring the closure of all doors for the building will be completed during the summer of 2008 and implemented during the 2008-09 school year.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

**There have been no improvements at this facility from the original review.**

The site area of 3.5 acres did not meet the minimum size requirement for middle or high school sites. The computer laboratory had only one shared printer instead of the required four printers or networked printer. Classrooms 212 and 213 were inadequate in size for the number of students present. The Art Room lacked the following equipment: Mechanical ventilation, ceramic kiln, and blackout areas. The music area did not have acoustical treatment. Science Rooms 201 and 202 were not located with easy access to outdoor activities or isolated to keep odors from the rest of the building. These science rooms lacked the following equipment: DC current, air vacuums, and adequate storage areas. There was no space dedicated to an auditorium; the gymnasium was used for this purpose. The gymnasium did not have the following equipment otherwise required for an auditorium: Acoustical panels, film screens, and distance learning capabilities. The classroom and laboratory space in each vocational area of agricultural education and agricultural mechanics were not adequate to meet curriculum needs.

Several exterior doors at this site did not latch and were not secured. The gymnasium was not handicapped accessible. The middle school was not handicapped accessible. Stained ceiling tiles existed throughout the facility. An excessive number of light lenses were damaged or missing in the middle school area. The damper actuator linkage was slipping on the combustion air damper in the Mechanical Room of the high school.

Elevated carbon dioxide levels in several of the classrooms indicated that outside air ventilation was inadequate. Several stairwell and fire doors were propped open.

### Additional Findings

The floor tile in the Vocational Agricultural Shop was believed to be asbestos containing material. The floor tile in this area was badly damaged and should be removed in an appropriate manner. Mold growth and visible signs of roof leaks were observed on the ceiling of the Vocational Agricultural Shop area. Rooms 116 and 117 have been converted to science classrooms. These rooms do not have the adequate equipment and materials. Both classrooms had gas fired heaters located within the spaces. The Fire Marshal reports could not be located at the facility. Emergency lighting was needed in the exit stairwell of the Boys' Locker Room. The showers in the Boys' Locker Room leaked significantly. Torn screen wire in the lockers of the Boys' Locker Room were a safety hazard. The unit ventilator in Classroom 213 was reported to be offline at the beginning of the school year and still remained offline. The time and day of week were incorrect on most of the programmable thermostats in the middle school area. Unrestricted access through the front doors allowed access to the first and second floor classrooms of the entire facility.

### **Valley Head Elementary School (Grades K-5)**

|                              |                    |
|------------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Year of Construction</b>  | : 1939, 1967, 1976 |
| <b>Total Square Feet</b>     | : 20,670 Sq. Ft.   |
| <b>Site Acreage</b>          | : 2.2 Acres        |
| <b>% Site In Flood Plain</b> | : 0                |

This facility was constructed in 1939 with additions in 1967 and 1976. A coal-fired boiler that appeared to be original to the structure provided heat. There was no air conditioning or mechanical ventilation. The building was currently under construction. On the OEPA facilities check sheet the principal marked the following as inadequate: Administrative facilities, teacher's workroom, counselor's office, and health service unit. The facilities may be adequate when the interior renovation is completed. The entire interior of this facility was being renovated and appeared to be near completion. This work has made a significant improvement regarding the interior aesthetics and building safety.

This school did not have a library. However, the local community public library was on the school property and students have access to this facility. The preschool classrooms were housed in two portable units. The portables were deteriorating and should be replaced in the near future.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*During 2007-08 academic school year, various Fire Code regulations were corrected to bring Valley Head Elementary into compliance with regulations as mandated by the WV State Fire Marshal. Randolph County Schools spent \$139,000 to complete electrical*

*upgrades, install fire doors, installed new stairwell to cafeteria, installed sheet rock throughout the entire building, painted the entire building, and replaced the flooring in the main hall. In addition, heat detectors were installed in the attic. The portable units will be removed from the property by January 2009. Upon completions of the renovations, the administrative facilities, teachers' workroom, counselors office, and health service office will be adequate. The renovations will be complete by August 31, 2008.*

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The portable classrooms were empty and not being utilized. The interior building renovation was complete. The interior of the building was aesthetically pleasing. A few issues remained with this building. It was not American Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant. The electrical boxes in the hallway needed to be secured. The windows were very old and needed to be replaced. The building was not air conditioned and did not have forced air ventilation. The old coal shoot at the rear of the building needed to be sealed. There was no evidence that the boiler had been inspected recently. The sidewalks needed to be repaired and sealed. There was no asbestos management plan onsite. There was no access security plan in place.

### **Countywide**

The energy efficiencies and indoor air quality of each of the Randolph County schools could be greatly enhanced with the addition of new heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and building automation controls. Performance contracting should be considered to achieve these goals more cost effectively. Other structures such as bus garages, maintenance shops and the administration offices would also benefit from the improvements that could be made in performance contracting.

### **RANDOLPH COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO FACILITIES FINDINGS**

*In November of 2008, Randolph County Schools will place on the election ballot a levy call that will seek funding for the replacement of a Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning system in one of the 1976 schools. The county will seek additional SBA funds to replace the other four. Randolph County Schools has explored the option of performance contracting, and found it to be ineffective as presented to the county administration. The administration will revisit performance contracting with other vendors to see if the needs of the county can be met.*

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Minimal Progress**

#### **Summary**

- The county needed to aggressively pursue performance contracting opportunities. Most of the schools' mechanical systems were at, or beyond, the expected service life of the equipment. Upgrading these antiquated systems and controls will require a significant capital investment. The county needed to create a strategic 10 year plan on upgrading these systems. The county Comprehensive Educational Facility Plan (CEFP) should be updated to include this strategic plan.
- There was no evidence of a preventive maintenance process in place at the county or facility levels. The county needed to create a comprehensive preventive maintenance plan for each respective facility. Preventive maintenance plans are an essential component to properly maintaining and efficiently operating a school facility.
- Numerous energy savings opportunities existed at each respective facility. The county needed to aggressively pursue creating a countywide energy management plan. Energy management plans have the potential to produce significant savings for the county. The county should immediately start pursuing the no or low cost energy savings opportunities and work toward implementing medium to high cost opportunities. The county should look at these possibilities with outside vendors that provide energy management services.
- The county currently uses a manual work order request system. The county should consider purchasing software that would automate the work order request system. An automated work order system would allow for more efficient operation and management of the work orders.
- Several facilities were easily accessible from the outside. In many cases, the facility could be entered unrestricted and bypass the office. The county needed to implement an access safety plan at each facility to ensure that the facility is operated as safely as possible with the existing infrastructure. The county will need to continue utilizing the Access Safety Grant from the School Building Authority (SBA) to upgrade infrastructure and increase the security at each facility.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Progress.** Randolph County Facility Improvements since the October 8, 2008 OEPA visit.

### Fire Marshal Repairs

- Beverly Elementary School. Fire alarm replacement.
- Coalton Elementary School. Door closures, new exit doors, fire alarm replacement.
- Harman Elementary/High School. Door closures and interior doors.
- Homestead Elementary School. New rescue ventilation windows.
- North Elementary School. Smoke detector, fire alarm replacement.
- Elkins Third Ward Elementary School. Fire alarm upgrade.
- Tygarts Valley Middle/High School. Door closures installed.
- Randolph Technical Center. Fire alarm replacement.
- Valley Head Elementary School. Fire alarm replacement.
- All Schools. Fire extinguisher inspection, sprinkler system inspection, and Ancil System in kitchens.

### Maintenance

- Beverly Elementary School. Ceiling replacement (two classrooms), freezer.
- Coalton Elementary School. Bleacher repair, window replacement, gymnasium wall repair/paint.
- Elkins High School. Painting, drywall repair.
- Harman Elementary/High School. Ceiling replacement, new railing and handicap ramp, new lights.
- Jennings Randolph Elementary School. Rest room renovations, grounds cleaned.
- Midland Elementary School. Painting, roof repair.
- Elkins Third Ward Elementary School. Rest room renovations.
- Tygarts Valley Middle/High School. Lockers moved from hall.
- Valley Head Elementary School. New propane furnace (replaced coal furnace).
- Board of Education. Sidewalk repaired and parking lot paved.
- Old Elkins High School. Demolition of garage, grounds clean up, construction fence surrounding grounds, bid meeting held for complete demolition.
- Wimer Field (football). Clean up and trash removal.

### Ongoing

- Elkins High School. Continued painting, paving (included Randolph Technical Center), repair/replacement stair treads.
- George Ward Elementary School. Electrical upgrade (Fire Marshal).
- Homestead Elementary School. Fire escape (Fire Marshal).
- Jennings Randolph Elementary School. Playground fill.
- Elkins Third Ward Elementary School. Holding fall school improvement weekend.
- Tygarts Valley Middle/High School. Drywall and tile repair from removing lockers, replacing locker room lockers.
- All Schools. Ceiling tile replacement, light coverings\*, HVAC preventive maintenance, Security systems, roof repairs.

\*Custom cut light covers were ordered due to difficulty in finding covers.

### Countywide

- Randolph County has started using School Dude and developed software for automated work orders and preventive maintenance schedules.
- The county employed Energy Education to assist with energy monitoring and savings.

The Randolph County School District has resolved the immediate health, safety, and maintenance issues. However, long term facility issues will need to be included in the Ten Year Comprehensive Educational Facilities Plan (CEFP) and funding will be necessary for the long term facility needs.

## 7.6. PERSONNEL.

### 7.6.1. Hiring. County boards follow hiring practices set forth in W.Va. Code. (W.Va. Code §§18A-4-7a, 18A-4-8, and 18-2E-3a)

The Team checked the Randolph County hiring practices through reviewing personnel documents and interviewing county staff.

The county retained its postings in a notebook filed by date of posting. Letters of recommendations made to the Randolph County Board of Education for board action were retained in a separate notebook. A file folder for each separate posting was maintained which contained the applications for a job posting, interview questions and responses, if applicable, and score sheets for professional personnel (not present in all folders). There was no matrix in the file to show the comparison of applicants. The front of the file folder contained a list of individuals who applied for the vacant position along with the seniority date of regular employees. The individual's name that was recommended for the position was highlighted. The Office of Education Performance Audit Team reviewed all postings in the notebook and reviewed file folders for specific vacancies. Additionally, the Team interviewed the following individuals responsible for personnel: Superintendent of Randolph County Schools; Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education; Coordinator of Personnel/Executive Secretary; and Certification Officer/Executive Secretary.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The Team checked the Randolph County Schools hiring practices through reviewing personnel documents and interviewing county staff.

The county continued to follow the same practice of retaining its postings in a notebook filed by date of posting. Letters to the board members from the superintendent concerning personnel changes to be made at the board meeting were also filed in a notebook. The county now attaches information to the letters regarding professional personnel who are recommended for employment showing by posting number the school, job title, name, effective date and type of certification held (Certified, not certified, permit, or out-of-field authorization).

A file folder was still retained for each posting. Attached to the front of the folder was a list of individuals who applied for the vacant position. The name of the person recommended for the job was highlighted. A completed matrix (grid) is now filed in the posting folder.

The Office of Education Performance Audits (OEPA) Team reviewed all postings in the notebook and reviewed file folders for specific vacancies. Additionally, the Team interviewed the following individuals responsible for personnel: Superintendent of

Randolph County Schools, Director of Special Education and Personnel, Assistant Superintendent, Secretary, and Executive Secretary/Coordinator of Services.

In addition to the assignment as Director of Special Education, this individual took on the responsibility of personnel July 1, 2008. It was evident that she has reviewed the report from the last Office of Education Performance Audits review and has worked to make several improvements as she understands them. The personnel official believed that all findings had been corrected; however, she stated that being “new” to personnel, she does not have complete understanding of some of the laws that are stated in W. Va. Code §18A-4-7a as to how they are to be implemented. As a result, the Team observed several errors that could have a big impact on who is considered the most qualified applicant for a position. The personnel official is making corrections as she learns the mistakes and made several corrections while the OEPA Team was on-site.

During interviews with the personnel official to verify various information or procedures used in the county, she would ask questions about some specific law or policy. Realizing that the county was doing something incorrectly, she would later return to the Team members with an updated, corrected form, document, or procedure that she said they would use in the future to correct a process or procedure. This, of course, cannot correct errors already made.

Unlike directors new to special education, Title I, finance, vocational education, etc., new county personnel directors are not provided training, so the majority of their training takes place “on the job” often learning the “hard way” by making mistakes. These mistakes can be very costly for a county board of education.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The Team reviewed the areas of noncompliance as well as areas that had met the standards during the (October 2008) visit. The new county office leadership reorganized the responsibilities of the central office administrators. This appeared to be an effective change and progress toward compliance was evident. The county office secretarial staff had also been reorganized and aligned.

#### **Noncompliance’s (Professional Personnel).**

The following noncompliance’s concern the statutory factors being properly applied per W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a in evaluating the qualifications of professional applicants. Failure to follow the statutory factors can result in the “wrong” applicant being recommended for employment or transfer.

Noncompliance (Professional Personnel).

1. When evaluating the qualifications of a regular employee using the second set of criteria in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a, the law states for criterion #5, "Specialized training directly related to the performance of the job as stated in the job description." However, Randolph County does not list or state the specialized training on its postings or in its job descriptions.

Randolph County gives "points and/or wins" to its applicants for any or all relevant specialized training the applicants list on their applications. However, based on Level IV grievance decisions (Walker v. Harrison County Board of Education April 2000 and Mitchell v. Wetzel County Board of Education May 2002, specialized training cannot be used as the fifth criteria in its evaluation of qualifications if not stated in the job description.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

**Continues to be a Noncompliance**

- 1.1 It appeared that there was no attempt to correct this finding until after July 1, 2008 when the Director of Special Education took over the responsibility of personnel. Then, the change was not implemented until late July, although the personnel director believed that it was being implemented earlier. (The revised job descriptions were not attached to the postings until late July.) In an attempt to correct this finding and evaluate correctly criterion #5, "specialized training directly related to the performance of the job as stated in the job description," in the second set of criteria, W. Va. Code §18A-4-7a, the county revised its job descriptions and listed a "new" category of Qualifications. The first qualification listed on the job description was the required certification. The second qualification listed on the job description was "Any training and/or experience as the Board of Education may find **appropriate to the position. Examples may include, but are not limited to:** Response to Intervention, Inquiry Based Math, Differentiated Instruction, Curriculum Mapping, DIBELS, Data Analysis, and Technology."

Based on Level IV grievance decision (Walker v. Harrison County Board of Education, April, 2000); specialized training cannot be used as the fifth criterion in its evaluations of qualifications if not stated in the job description. Examples of training were not specific.

- 1.2 This revised job description is attached to every classroom teacher posting from preschool through secondary vacancies. The county gives the applicant credit if he/she has one or more of the above trainings listed on the posting. It would appear that the applicant would also get credit for any relevant training, as those listed on the job description are only "examples" of training.

However, this does not appear to meet the requirement of listing in the job description “specialized training directly related to the performance of the job.” The trainings listed are examples of training. It is not specific to a specific job. DIBELS, for example, would not be directly related to the performance of the job of a biology teacher. When evaluating this criterion, it is either “yes” or “no.” Therefore, if the applicant has only one or two of the generic trainings that were listed, even if these were not relevant to the job (such as a biology teacher having training in DIBELS), the county would give credit for this criterion. The criterion in the second set of criteria, is not written the same as the criterion in the first set of criteria in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a.

Specialized training should not be included under “Qualifications,” in the job description as qualifications identify what is needed to be considered for the job. Specialized training directly related to the performance of the job should have its own space on the job description as it improves the qualifications of the applicant and credit is given if the individual meets this criterion. It does not keep the applicant from being considered for the job.

- 1.3 The county uses two different applications for individuals applying for vacant positions. Applicants who are “new” are to complete information relevant to the first set of criteria set forth in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a. A regular employee completes a different application which lists information relevant to the second set of criteria set forth in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a. Therefore, the new applicant, when being compared to a regularly employed teacher, may not have listed relevant specialized training as listed in the job description resulting in receiving no consideration or “weight” for this criterion.
- 1.4 The county also uses specialized training as its method of determining the most qualified applicant when there is a tie. However, a regular employee might list only the training listed on the job description, not all his/her training. The county’s applications for a vacant position did not give the regularly employed candidate that opportunity.

To correct this personnel finding, Randolph County should pursue the following corrective actions:

- The county needs to identify for each posting what specialized training is needed for the position and insert only that training in the job description.
- Since there are often regularly employed classroom teachers applying for vacant jobs along with “new” teachers, and the second criteria set forth in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a is used, and because specialized training is used when there is a tie in criteria won, the county should list both criteria listed in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a on the application. Separate entries would provide an opportunity to list specialized training directly related to the performance of the

job as stated in the job description and for other relevant and/or specialized training, which considers all training, not just that listed on the job description. It should be noted on the application that all applicants should complete both areas on specialized training, understanding it is used as a tie-breaker. With this information, the “tie” candidates could be more fairly judged when determining the most qualified candidate.

Note: When the personnel official recognized the problems with using two separate applications (new and regular employees), she immediately worked to combine the applications into one where the county can collect information to address both sets of criteria in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a. She stated that the county will use the new application in the future. This should be reviewed in a follow-up visit.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

### **Partial Compliance**

- 1.1 The Team reviewed all professional personnel posting and files from July 2009 until the October 2009 review. Evidence was found that the criteria in W. Va. Code §18A-4-7a was applied in selecting the most qualified applicant. The bid forms were cumbersome and difficult to locate information, but the forms did request the information required for both sets of criteria as listed in W.Va. Code.
- 1.2 Specialized training was not being listed on the postings, but it also was not being counted as part of the scoring during the interview.

**Recommendation.** The Team recommended that the personnel director refer to the school and county strategic plans to determine the training needed for each position posted and enlist the assistance of the principal to identify the training needed for the position.

- 1.3 There were some regular employee bid sheets in which the employee did not complete the information required on the form. They put their name and address on the form but did not list information on each of the criterion. The personnel director would then pull the files for each regular employee who failed to provide the information and search for the information. It is the employee’s professional responsibility to provide the information requested on the bid sheet if they want to be considered for the position.

**Recommendation.** The Team recommended that the personnel director contact the employees that did not complete the form and give them the opportunity to correct it. If they do not complete the form the personnel director would be compelled to judge the applicants’ qualifications for the job on the information provided.

- 1.4 The personnel director indicated that the tie breaker under the second set of criteria was now seniority. When hiring under the first set of criteria it is the 7<sup>th</sup> criterion of “Other” which would be the questions formulated by the interview team.
2. W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a (c) (6) states, “Past performance evaluations conducted pursuant to section twelve [§18A-2-12], article two of this chapter”. In §18A-4-7a (d) (6), it states, “Receiving an overall rating of satisfactory in the previous two evaluations conducted pursuant to section twelve [§18A-2-12], article two of this chapter.”

Randolph County did not follow the requirements of using only evaluations that had been conducted pursuant to W.Va. Code §18A-2-12 in evaluating the qualification of applicants. The county used any previous evaluation, including substitute teacher evaluations and student teacher evaluation if the applicant was a new graduate. These evaluations were not conducted as per §18A-2-12.

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

It appeared that Randolph County had corrected this noncompliance.

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** In reviewing the interview files the Team found that Randolph County was only giving credit to those applicants that verified they had been evaluated per W. Va. Code §18A-2-12.

3. Seniority is the 7<sup>th</sup> criterion in the 2<sup>nd</sup> set of criteria used for determining the qualification of classroom teachers.

According to the coordinator of personnel, seniority acquired by substitute teachers is not considered when a substitute teacher applies for a posted position in which a regular employee applies. W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a (g) states, “. . . substitutes shall accrue seniority exclusively for the purpose of applying for employment as a permanent, full-time teacher.”

The coordinator of personnel indicated that regularly employed personnel are hired over all new applicants, even if the new applicant wins in the overall qualifications. It appears that when a regular employee applies for a posted position, applications of new personnel are not considered; therefore, no one would know if a new applicant is more qualified than a regular employee.

As per the coordinator of personnel, no applicant has been chosen who had less seniority than other applicants; therefore, no request has been made for a written

reason why an individual with less seniority was selected over a more senior applicant.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Partial Compliance; Partial Noncompliance**

- 3.1 It was evident that measures had been taken to correct this noncompliance; however, it has been an over correction, by adding “substitute seniority” as an 8<sup>th</sup> criterion when using the first set of criteria in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a, giving credits and points for substitute seniority. (Note: Seniority is not used as a separate criterion for the first set of criteria.)

When using the first set of criteria, if the board wishes to consider seniority (which was accrued as a substitute teacher), it should be included in the 7<sup>th</sup> criterion, “other measures or indicators upon which the relative qualifications may be fairly judged.”

- 3.2 The personnel official stated that the county does consider “new” applicants when regular employees apply for a vacant position. Only one individual, however, was found to be more qualified and hired over a regular employee, who was the most senior applicant. The new employee was hired as a counselor (see posting P0750809-37) over a regular employee. Although a reason for not selecting the most senior applicant was not requested in writing, the regular employee, who was the most senior, scheduled a conference with the personnel official to discuss the matter. A grievance was not filed.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The 8<sup>th</sup> criterion that had been created for substitute seniority had been removed from the matrix. The personnel director verified that substitute seniority is determined and applied under seniority when using the second set of criteria for all substitute applicants that have accrued substitute seniority.

4. The 1<sup>st</sup> criterion listed in the qualifications of classroom teachers W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a (c) (1) and (d) (1) is, “appropriate certification, licensure or both.” Randolph County Schools does not list any certification requirements on their postings, nor is the required certification listed on the job description. Sample Posting: Math teacher, “EHS”.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Partial Compliance; Partial Noncompliance**

- 4.1 The county has worked to improve the above noncompliance by listing the required certification on the posting; however, it needs to include all certifications which could meet the certification requirement of the specific posting.

Example: Postings 0750809-7 and 11, (Title I Reading Specialist) was posted with the required certification of elementary education and Reading Specialist K-12. The reading certification can be met with one of the following: MA in reading specialist, completion of graduate level reading specialist program, reading authorization, or reading endorsement. (WVBE Policy 5202, 8.2.2 b.) An applicant with a reading endorsement would not have been considered for the above positions.

- 4.2 There was only one posting observed which did not list a required certification. Posting Number 0750809-4, was posted for 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Core Curriculum Team Leader. Certification required: "Demonstrated knowledge and experience in sixth grade curriculum essential." This should have been listed on the posting under "Special Skills and Criteria." The applicant would have been required to meet these criteria in order to have met the "standards of the posting."
- 4.3 West Virginia Department of Education lists in the Course Codes the endorsements which meet the certification requirements of a posting. All prepared postings need to be reviewed by the personnel official prior to being posted to ensure that all certifications are listed.
- 4.4 The Board hired two substitute teachers who were not certified. These individuals were NOT placed on the substitute list.

The county should not hire individuals who are not certified or who do not have their paperwork for certification in process as confirmed by the certification coordinator.

- 4.5 The county posts position as "possible." The positions can be filled or rescinded.

Reasons given for such postings, included receiving a resignation and posting the position prior to the resignation being accepted by the Randolph County Board of Education (RCBE). If the RCBE does not approve the resignation, the individual will remain and the posting will be rescinded. The positions included: Second Grade, Third Ward Elementary School; Science teacher, Tygarts Valley High School. This also includes service personnel positions. This is not a new practice, as the principal's positions at Elkins High School

and Tygarts Valley High School were posted as “possible” positions in February 2007.

This procedure needed to be changed as it could be seen as the county’s opportunity to not meet the requirement of W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a to fill the position within thirty days.

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

### Compliance

- 4.1 The Team reviewed postings and found specific certifications for the posting were listed on the job posting. A few postings did not have the certification and they were rescinded and reposted with the appropriate certification listed.
  - 4.2 The two substitutes that were hired, but not called, had expired certificates as short term substitutes. One individual was no longer employed by the county and the other renewed his short term substitute permit and was working as a substitute for Randolph County Schools.
  - 4.3 No recent posting was found that had “possible openings” and the personnel director indicated that practice had been stopped.
5. Posting on West Virginia Department of Education Job Bank K-12.

Professional Personnel: The coordinator of personnel stated that only a few vacancies had been posted on the West Virginia Department of Education Job Bank. Professional personnel vacancies were not posted on the county Website; however, they were posted in all schools, the board office, and were placed on a county personnel hotline.

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

### Compliance

The county is posting its vacancies on the West Virginia Department of Education K-12 Job Bank and on its County Website. Although it is not clear in law that this is a requirement for professional personnel, it is a continued recommendation for Randolph County, as they continue to have difficulty in recruiting certified individuals and filling posted positions. Records showed as of October 10, 2001, approximately 20 jobs were reposted due to not having certified applicants. Several individuals had been hired on permits or out-of-field authorizations.

**Note: This item should have been listed as a recommendation on the initial report.**

6. Matrix to show the qualifications of applications.

Although the law does not state that there shall be a matrix to determine the comparison of applicants, a matrix provides a clear picture in comparing applicants. Randolph County Schools has a matrix listing the applicants for a vacant position and their total points. However, it did not use a matrix in comparing the qualifications of applicants in each of the criterion areas. The county used score sheets for some positions; however, the scores, for each criterion, were not recorded in a format to make it easy to compare and determine the most qualified applicant. Some sheets were not included in several files the Team reviewed. Such files included: First Grade Teacher August 10 – 16, 2007, Kindergarten Teacher, North School, July 17-23, and Title I Teacher, North Elem. July 17-23, 2007.

**The Team recommended that a matrix or consistent system be prepared and used to compare the qualifications of candidates in each of the criterion listed in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a.**

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

**Noncompliance**

- 6.1 A matrix grid was being used, but the data were not complete or always accurate.
- 6.2 Until the OEPA Team member arrived on October 8, 2008, the personnel official did not know that she was not requesting needed data from new applicants. When new applicants completed an application for “new” employees, which the new personnel official created in an effort to improve the process, new employers did not have an opportunity to provide information if they were to be compared to regularly employed teachers. The personnel official has created a new application that collects data relevant to both sets of criteria in W.Va. §18A-4-7a. Once implemented, this error should be corrected.
- 6.3 The Team reviewed several postings with problems cited; however, this should be corrected when a new application is used. **A follow-up review is needed to ensure the correction is in place.**
- 6.4 Other errors noted:
  - Posting # P0750808-5 dated July 2- 9, 2008. EMI/BD/LD (reposted). An applicant’s application file stated that she had everything except autism, gifted, and profoundly impaired. Her name was not on the matrix as being considered for the position. An applicant who is not fully certified was later hired into the position. She was also an applicant for the first posting.

6.5 A review of several matrices showed that the county evaluated the candidates as follows when one or more regular employees apply. The matrix was often very difficult to determine who the most qualified individual was.

- One point is given to applicants who meet the certification requirement (yet not all valid certificates are listed on the posting).
- One point is given to the applicant with the total amount of teaching experience (Experience is taken at face value). An applicant, for example, listed eight years of experience on the application. A review of the records indicated she had “worked” during an eight year period as a substitute teacher and as a regular teacher since November 2007, for an actual total of less than four years.
- One point is given for existence of teaching experience in the required certification area. Individuals who had only substitute experience were not given credit for teaching in the certification area.
- One point is given for the highest degree level.
- One point is given for specialized training directly related to the performance of the job as listed in the job description. (It would appear that the method used is questionable. Refer to #1 noncompliance above)
- One point is given for receiving an overall rating of satisfactory in the previous two evaluations conducted as per W.Va Code§18A-2-12.
- One point is given for total seniority.

The Team reviewed the following matrix for evaluating candidates using the second set of criteria in §18A-4-7a\*

| Applicants Name | X | Applicant certification /licensure (1 pt.) | Total Years Experience (1pt.) | Experience in Certification Area (1 pt) | Degree AB/BS/ MA (1 pt.) | Relevant Specialized Training (1 pt.) | Past Performance evaluations conducted as per W. Va. §18A-2-12 (1 pt.) | Total Seniority (1pt.) | Total Points |
|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------|
| Applicant A     |   | 1  | (1)                           | 1 (1)                                   | BA                       | 1                                     |  | 1                      | 4            |
| Applicant B     |   | 1  | -                             | -                                       | BA                       | -                                     | -  | -                      | 1            |
| Applicant C     |   | 1  | -                             | -                                       | BA                       | -                                     | -  | -                      | 1            |
| Applicant D     |   | 1  | (1) -                         | -                                       | MS 1                     | 1                                     | -  | -                      | 3            |
| Applicant E     |   | 1  | (26) 1                        | (1) 1                                   | MS 1                     | -                                     | -  | -                      | 4            |
| Applicant F     |   | 1  | (2)                           | (2) 1                                   | BA                       | -                                     |  |                        | 2            |

The headings for this matrix have been corrected to reflect that in law; but the “markings” were the same.

6.6 The matrices are difficult to read and to know at a glance who is the most qualified. In lieu of placing the data on the matrix, such as actual number of years experience (years/ months/days), the county listed number of years for “some of the applicants.” For others, a hyphen (-) was placed in the blanks. Other than the degree level listed, there is either a 1 (for one point) or a hyphen (-). Total points for each person are found in the final column.

When one or more regular employees apply for a position, all accurate information must be listed for the applicants who meet the standards of the posting such as:

- Appropriate certification. Yes or No. Yes = 1 point (If not certified, do not consider under this criteria. Use first set of criteria).
- Total amount of teaching experience = List actual amount, such as 9.45 years, for all applicants. 1 point for highest total.
- Existence of teaching experience in the certified area. Yes or No. Yes = 1 point.
- Degree Level in the required certification area. Identify BA, MA, Doctorate = 1 point for the highest level.

- Specialized training directly related to the performance of the job as stated in the job description. Yes or No. Yes = 1 point.
- Overall rating of satisfactory evaluation (previous two as per W.Va. Code §18A-2-12). Yes or No. Yes = 1 point.
- Seniority. Greatest Seniority 1 point (including accrued substitute seniority for substitutes).

Total points possible = 7. (Some counties determine wins and losses by identifying the applicant with the most wins. Either method yields the same results). If there is a tie, the county, as per its policy, will use criterion 5 from the first set of criteria (ALL relevant specialized training) to break the tie.

By responding to each criterion, it is clear that each applicant's qualification was considered.

- 6.7 The county uses the second set of criteria set forth in W. Va. Code §18A-4-8b any time a regularly employed classroom teacher applies for a job. This criterion is to be used only when the regular applicants **meet the standards of the posting**. If they do then, the first set of criteria in W. Va. Code §18A-4-7a is to be used.

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

### Compliance (except for 6.6)

- 6.1 The new application form addressed the appropriate information needed for both sets of hiring criteria. Regular employees apparently failed to understand the importance of completing the forms with the appropriate information. Regular employees needed to be trained and/or reminded that they must provide all information requested on the form. The personnel office had been going to the employee file and locating the information that was not provided by the employee.
- 6.2 The Team reviewed all posting files from July 2000 to the present (October 2009) and found the correct set of criteria was being used when regular employees bid on jobs but were not certified in the area required on the posting. Administrative positions also used the first set of criteria to determine the most qualified applicant.
- 6.3 The matrices for each position were included in the posting files. The point system continued to be used, but the information on the matrices was easily verified on the applications in the file. Degree level contained MA for those

who had a Masters degree, but credit was appropriately given to those who had an MA in the relevant field as determined by the posting. Relevant specialized training was not listed on the majority of postings, the exception was Title I postings. Points were not given to the applicants when the training was not listed on the posting.

Recommendation. The Team recommended that the personnel director refer to the school/county Five-Year Strategic Plans to identify training that would enhance the teaching and learning for each posting. Principals should be consulted when the posting is for their school.

- 6.4 The new personnel director indicated that when breaking a tie using the first set of criteria, the 7<sup>th</sup> criterion “Other” is used to break the tie. When the second set of criteria is applied, the 7<sup>th</sup> criterion “seniority” is being used. This change eliminates from breaking ties with “relevant specialized training” which has not been included on the posting and cannot be awarded points.
  - 6.5 The Team found the second set of criteria was only being used when regularly employed classroom teachers applied for the position and met the criteria set forth on the posting.
  - 6.6 The only noncompliance found was that the second set of criteria was being used to determine the most qualified applicant for mentor positions. These are not classroom teaching positions; therefore, the second set of criteria should not be applied.
7. W. Va. Code §18A-2-1 states that, “. . . the superintendent shall provide the principal at the school at which the professional educator or paraprofessional employee is to be employed an opportunity to interview all qualified applicants and make recommendations to the county superintendent regarding their employment.” In speaking with the principal, Elkins Middle School, he stated that if there were several candidates for a position and some question as to who was the most qualified, he would be invited to interview the candidates. However, if it appeared to be “black and white” as to who was the most qualified, he was not contacted to participate in an interview process.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Noncompliance**

In an interview, the Director of Special Education/Personnel Official and the Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education, both stated that all principals were given an opportunity to interview applicants.

In an effort to verify this with principals, the Team member called five principals to verify they were given such opportunity. As per their response, this standard continues to be a noncompliance:

- Principal, George Ward Elementary School. Three new teachers this year; two were new employees and two transferred in from within the county, and one long term substitute. The principal did not have an opportunity to interview the three “new” employees or the two who transferred to the school.
- Principal, Jennings Randolph Elementary School. Title I teacher (no). Gifted teacher (yes). The principal stated that principals cannot interview employed teachers who wish to transfer. This principal would like to interview ALL teachers who wish to come to her school and has made this request. It has been denied because the interview cannot be used to determine the qualifications of the teacher.
- Principal, Elkins Third Ward Elementary School: EMI/LD/BD Teacher (yes). Title I Teacher (no), Second grade teacher (no). The principal stated that he would like to interview all teachers.
- The principals of the following schools indicated to the individual school audit teams that they were involved in interviews: Coalton School, Tygarts Valley High School, Elkins Middle School, and Elkins High School.

Note: The principals at Jennings Randolph Elementary and Elkins Third Ward Elementary both said they got to interview one teacher (Gifted teacher at Jennings Randolph and the special education teacher at Elkins Third Ward. They were both “new” teachers to the county. However, they both said that they were not permitted to interview teachers (transfers) new to their respective schools, although they had requested to do so. Both principals realized that the “interview” could not be considered in determining the qualifications of an applicant if the second set of criteria in §W.Va. Code 18A-4-7a were used; but they wanted their “new” teachers to be aware to the school’s philosophy, their goals, the principal’s expectation of his/her staff, etc. The interview process should also provide the principal an opportunity to review the validity of the information placed on the matrix. For example, in the interview, the principal might discover that the applicant has only three years of experience, as perhaps eight years as they had listed on the applicant, which in turn was put on the matrix. (Some applicants will work a few days in a year as a substitute, yet say they have a year’s experience working as a substitute teacher.) They might discover the applicant put a master’s degree on their application, but that master’s degree was not within the certification listed on the applicant and in turn, on the matrix. It’s not unusual for candidates to complete their employment application incorrectly. The Team found such errors in Randolph County which are listed in the report.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** The Team reviewed seven interview files for positions at various county schools and found the school principal at the schools where the jobs were posted participated in the interview process. Principals signed off on their interview forms.

8. Principal, Pickens Elementary/High School. W.Va. Code §18A-2-9 specifies that a certified principal shall be assigned to each school. As per the superintendent, there were no certified applicants for the vacant principal position at Pickens Elementary/High School; therefore, the Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education was named as principal of the school and a teacher in the school was named “Lead Teacher.” There was no job description on the posting “Lead Teacher”. There was no board action to place the Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education as principal at the school and it was not listed in the assistant superintendent’s job description. Essentially, the Lead Teacher serves as the administrative leader of the school.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

#### **Compliance**

The above noncompliance appears to have been corrected. However, other concerns were observed during the school visit, which may need further investigation or review regarding countywide personnel. Refer to New Issues at the end of the Hiring section.

9. Postings that were not filled, (Spanish, math, BD/MI/SLD/Visually Impaired) were posted several times (each as a new posting) during the school year. There was no evidence that these postings were continuously posted or that they were placed at each posting on the county’s Website or on the West Virginia Department of Education Job Bank.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

#### **Partial Compliance**

At the time of the progress review, Randolph County did not have a procedure in place to continuously post unfilled vacancies; however, they did repost vacancies as new positions with a (New posting number). There are days between postings when the job is not posted. For example:

- EMI/SLD/BD Teacher: Third Ward Elementary School: Posting dates: July 2, - July 9 and July 24, July 30.
- Gifted: Midland, Jennings Randolph, July 22-28 and August 5–August 11.
- Preschool George Ward: July 22 – July 28; August 8 - August 14; August 19, August 25 and Sept. 22 – 26.
- County policy states that the Board creates positions. The Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education stated that he asks the superintendent who requests the Randolph County Board of Education (RCBE) to create positions for his area of responsibility. The Director of Special Education stated that she just told the superintendent and Board when she needed a new position. It was not officially approved by the Randolph County Board of Education action since it would be required by an Individualized Education Program.
- The Director of Special Education stated when they decide not to fill a position the personnel office “rescinds” the board posting. No formal action is taken by the Randolph County Board of Education to eliminate the position.

Example. Hearing impaired position posted June 12, 2008 through June 18, 2008. There was a certified applicant, but the position was rescinded by the personnel official and not filled. W. Va. Code §18A-4-7a states if one certified person applies for the position, it is to be filled within 30 working days. In this case, an aide/interpreter was hired. (Note: There is no classification named “interpreter.”)

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

### Compliance

- Positions that did not have applicants were reposted with a different number for another five day period. Unfilled vacancies are to be continuously posted, but all postings must have a beginning and end date. Postings are not to be posted with “until filled” as the end date. The Team recommended that the same posting number be maintained and each posting kept in the same file to show the continuous posting of the position and the lack of applicants.
  - Positions that are rescinded should be taken before the board with the reason for the recommendation to rescind the position.
10. Recruiting of Professional Personnel. Randolph County did not do any recruiting of professional personnel outside of regular posting positions at schools and on the hotline.

## **No Progress**

The personnel official did no recruiting this year and was not aware that any was done by county personnel. Due to failure to fill positions during their first posting, the county should participate, at a minimum, in local teacher recruitment programs.

### **Progress Review (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The personnel director posted all job postings on the State and county websites, at all schools, and at the county office. The previous personnel director attended recruiting fairs at Fairmont State University, Glenville State College, and West Virginia University. The current personnel director plans to attend recruitment fairs this year. He was also contacting local teacher colleges to receive lists of recent and future education graduates.

**Recommendation.** The Team recommended that the personnel director electronically contact personnel directors in the State through the list serve when looking for certified teachers in special areas and request them to direct any prospective teachers to contact Randolph County Schools.

### **Noncompliance's (Service Personnel).**

Noncompliance of the statutory factors being properly applied according to W.Va. Code §18A-4-8b in the selection of a service personnel for vacant position.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

11. W.Va. Code §18A-4-8b (b) outlines the order in which applicants are to be considered for posted positions. Regularly employed service personnel are to be considered before service personnel, whose employment has been discontinued, Reduction in Force (RIF) list. However, it appeared that in an August 2007 posting for an aide position, RIF aide, as stated on her application, was selected for an aide's position over a regular cook at George Ward Elementary. As per the personnel coordinator, the county always hires individuals who hold the classification, including those on the RIF list, over those who do not hold coordinator stated that the cook, told her that she didn't want to take the competency test for aide. There was no such written documentation in file.

In talking with the individual by phone on February 26, 2007, she said she was never contacted about the aide position posted August 17, 2007, and never said that she didn't want to take the competency test. Although the coordinator of personnel stated that she sent by certified mail postings of all service personnel

position to those individuals on the RIF list, the Team was unable to get a copy of such notice sent to the individual.

The individual said that she did pass up an aide position later in the school year, after she had been injured on the job.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Partial Progress**

As per the personnel official, the Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education, and a secretary, the county had no personnel placed on the reduction-in-force (RIF) list this year (2008-2009). Therefore, the above situation did not exist this year.

However, a review of the service personnel posting files found the following issues:

Posting No. SP0750809-20: Preschool Aide, Harmon School, dated August 27-September 2, 2008: An applicant was selected for the position. Her name was on the front sheet stapled to the folder as the person hired. However, her application in the file was dated 8-22-08 for Aide/Bus Aide @ George Ward. She had no application in the file for the Harmon Preschool position.

To follow through, the Team reviewed the posting for George Ward, Aide/Bus Aide Posting dated August 21 – August 27, 2008, and found an applicant was hired for that position. The individual hired for Preschool Aide at Harman School application was not in this file. Her name was not on the sheet showing her as an applicant. The Team member spoke to the county personnel secretary about the situation, but she could not explain it. She did say the person hired for George Ward (Aide/Bus Aide) had more seniority than the other individual and would have gotten the George Ward position. The Team member did not have an opportunity to speak with the personnel professional.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Partial Progress**

The service personnel seniority list for both regular employees and substitutes needed to be kept up to date and maintained. The substitute service seniority list appeared to be maintained by the substitute calling secretary rather than the personnel office. The regular employee seniority list is published twice a year as required by West Virginia Code, however, names were omitted that were hired prior to the published date. Some regular employees' names could not be found on either regular or substitute employee seniority list. The form on the outside of the posting file would have the seniority date written beside the name of each candidate, but the Team was not sure where the seniority date was found.

Provided that the seniority dates written beside their name was accurate, the Team found that the process for hiring the correct employee was consistent with W. Va. Code §18A-4-8b. A written county policy or procedures was not found.

12. W.Va. Code §18A-4-15 (a) (B): Posting of Service Personnel on Workers Compensation. Two individuals had been on Workers Compensation more than 30 working days (perhaps since the beginning of the school year). As per W.Va. Code §18A-4-15 (a) (B), these positions must be posted if the absence is to extend beyond 30 working days. Individuals filling these positions acquire regular employment status with the exception of regular employee job bidding rights (does not accrue regular seniority) but is accorded all other rights, privileges and benefits pertaining to the position. By failing to post the positions, substitute employees may have been deprived of long-term employment. There appeared to be no process in place whereby the coordinator of personnel, who is responsible for posting vacant positions, receives information concerning employees on workers compensation (days absent, when there is a need to post temporary position, etc). It appeared that this information is known by the employee benefit specialist and the individual who calls substitute personnel to work.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Compliance**

As per the personnel official, she is now monitoring the Worker's Compensation absences for the purpose of posting the positions. (Employee absent for more than 30 working days). One position (Custodian III), has been posted and filled this year as per W.Va. Code §18A-4-15.

13. Posting of Aide positions. All aide positions are posted as Aide II. Aide vacancies should be posted as Aide. The classification of an Aide as Aide II, III, IV is determined as per W.Va. Code 18A-4-8 (8) – (11).

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Noncompliance**

Vacant positions were not being posted as "aide," but as preschool aide, kindergarten aide, special education aide. Although, the specific classification (aide II, aide III, aide IV) is not on the posting, the aide positions should be posted only as aide. There are no classifications for preschool aide, kindergarten aide, etc. Also, by posting the position as aide, it will provide the principal the opportunity to assign aides within his/her building.

By posting assignment specific it could be impossible to reassign the individual outside his/her hired assignment.

Although, the county corrected the situation with aides as Aide II, Aide III, Aide IV, they are repeating the same practice by posting the secretary/accountant positions in schools as accountant II/secretary II. Like the aide postings, this could be in error, as a school secretary is a secretary III if he/she has served for eight years in a position which meets the definition of Secretary II or Secretary III.

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

### Partial Compliance

“Aide” postings were posted as “Aide” for all postings the Team reviewed. The problem that has occurred is the Legislature changed W. Va. Code §18A-4-8b(d)(3) & (4) to require counties to post aide positions specific to the duties they would be required to perform. This actually changed requirements back to the way the county previously posted the aide positions.

Also within the change in W. Va. Code §18A-4-8b(d)(3) & (4), all custodian positions must be posted with the specific shift times. Several custodian postings had only “afternoon or “evening” shift. The exact shift times should be listed on all custodian posting. Postings SP# 11, 22, 26, & 35 did not have a time or shift listed.

The personnel office was following the OEPA report, but the law changed in June of 2009 that required the postings to be specific which was the way Randolph County had been posting prior to the OEPA recommendation. West Virginia Code must be followed.

#### 14. Posting on WV Job Bank (18A-4-8b (g) (1)).

Service Personnel postings were not listed on the West Virginia Department of Education Job Bank, a Website available for the use of the county board. W.Va. Code §18A-4-8b (g) (1) states, “Posting locations shall include any Website maintained by or available for the use of the county board.”

Randolph County Schools posts its service personnel vacancies on its County Website; however, the posting does not include that required in W.Va. Code §18A-4-8b (job description, the period of employment, the amount of pay and benefits prospective applicants to understand the particulars of the job), but only lists the position and location. Example: Cook, Elkins High School.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Recommendation Followed**

The county is now posting service personnel positions on both the county and state website.

#### 15. Service Personnel Job Descriptions.

There was only one posting (cafeteria manager) reviewed, whereby, the job description listed the qualifications for the position included passage of the State Competency Test. Other postings such as Sub Cooks, Posted February 20-26, 2007, RCS (Randolph County Schools) did not have passage of the competency test listed as a qualification. Neither was it listed on a Special Education Aide II, Itinerant, August 23-31, 2007.

**The Team recommended that service job descriptions be reviewed and Passage of the State Competency Test, where applicable, be included in all qualifications listed on the job description.**

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Corrected**

#### 16. Extracurricular.

Coaches' Postings. All postings, including coaches, had a page attached to the posting that states, "Unless otherwise noted, all professional positions will receive the salary noted in the state code 18A-4-2 with consideration for years of service and amount of college training. All service personnel positions will receive salaries according to 18A-4-8a and with regard for experience and training. Benefits afforded successful candidates include optional health and life insurance, retirement, and sick leave (1 ½ days per month worked)."

This attachment to extracurricular postings was not appropriate for coaches or other extra-curricular positions. This appeared to be the result of not having someone, such as a personnel director to review/proof-read the work done in the Personnel Office.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Compliance**

The above finding concerning the posting of coaches' positions had been corrected.

A West Virginia Department of Education Certification Coordinator reviewed certification of coaches and found the county to be in compliance. It was noted that two citizen soccer coaches were hired September 25, 2008, effective August 1, 2008. Both hold the West Virginia Secondary Schools Activity Commission (SSAC) Coaching Authorization. As per an interview with the Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education, the coaches began coaching August 1, 2008. It was later found that the positions, which must be posted each year, had not been posted, neither had the coaches been hired. The coaches were then removed from the positions until the jobs were posted, they were rehired, and requested a renewal of their license. Since the coaches actually started work on August 1, they will be paid for the time worked prior to September 25, 2008. The Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education stated that one of the coaches held an expired substitute permit; however, the Team only found a coaching authorization in his file.

17. Coach. The job description requires a West Virginia Teacher Certificate. Individuals can also coach with a coaching authorization; however, that is not listed on the job description.

**The Team recommended that all job description be revised and updated in the area of qualifications.**

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Compliance**

#### **This finding had been corrected.**

The Team concluded that personnel files were not maintained appropriately and that hiring procedures were not consistent with West Virginia Code.

#### **New Issues**

1. W. Va. Code §18A-2-9 states that the county board of education shall employ and assign, through written contract, public school principals. . . and assistant principals . . .". The following principal and assistant principal did not have a signed written contract.
  - There was no contract on file for an assistant principal (half-time) at Elkins Middle School. This is required before an individual enters duties. (W.Va. Code §18A-2-2)
  - Principal (half-time), teacher (half-time), Pickens School. A signed contract was not on file for the principal's position.

2. Two specialists' positions (reading and math) were hired through RESA VII. The Team was unable to locate official information verifying that the positions were appropriately hired.

**7.6.2. Licensure.** Professional educators and other professional employees required to be licensed under West Virginia Board of Education policy are licensed for their assignments including employees engaged in extracurricular activities. (W. Va. Code §18A-3-2; Policy 5202)

The Team found numerous violations of (W.Va. Code §18A-3-2 and WVBE Policy 5202). Chart 20 explains the certification issues the Team observed through a detailed review of the certified list, WVEIS Master Course Schedule, and the West Virginia Department of Education Certification Database. Randolph County was provided the opportunity to correct coding errors, and corrected ones were removed from this report.

Chart 20

| School Location | Educator | WVEIS Assignment   | Current Certification            | Correction Needed   |
|-----------------|----------|--|----------------------------------|---|
| 075-701         | Educator | 1465 H   | Business Journalism<br>MR<br>SLD | Not a valid course code check WVEIS Manual                                |
| 075-504         | Educator | 6609-L Phys ED   | Safety Health<br>PE              | For L in 6 <sup>th</sup> digit, needs endorsement code 4100, 4104 or 4109 |
| 075-503         | Educator | 4327-X   | Health<br>PE                     | Not a valid course code check WVEIS Manual                                |
|                 | Educator | 7901   | Multi-Categorical                | Not a valid course code check WVEIS Manual                                |
| 075-401         | Educator | 3008-J<br>Pregeom/Alg<br>4008-REng. LA<br>4808- R Dev<br>Rdg | Social Studies 5-<br>Ad          | Needs Math, English and Spec. Ed. endorsements                            |
|                 | Educator | 5660 Spanish<br>5661 Spanish                                 | Elem. K-6                        | Needs Spanish Endorsement   |
|                 | Educator | 8015-6<br>COLTCH<br>8015-7<br>COLTCH                         | SLD<br>BD                        | Correct 6 <sup>th</sup> digit code to reflect correct exceptionality      |

| School Location | Educator | WVEIS Assignment   | Current Certification                     | Correction Needed   |
|-----------------|----------|--|---|---|
|                 | Educator | 8015-7<br>COLTCH   | BD<br>SLD<br>MR                           | Correct 6 <sup>th</sup> digit code to reflect correct exceptionality  |
|                 | Educator | 8015-8   | SLD<br>Indust. Arts<br>Woodshop<br>Metals | Correct 6 <sup>th</sup> digit code to reflect correct exceptionality  |
|                 | Educator | 8015-6-<br>COLTCH  | SLD<br>MI<br>Elem k-6                     | Correct 6 <sup>th</sup> digit code to reflect correct exceptionality  |
|                 | Educator | 8015-7   | SLD<br>BD<br>MI<br>Autism                 | Correct 6 <sup>th</sup> digit code to reflect correct exceptionality  |
| 075-207         | Educator | 6600-K Phys Ed   | Health/PE<br>Safety                       | Correct 6 <sup>th</sup> digit or obtain proper special education endorsement<br>Not certified to teach K or PK levels |
|                 | Educator | 2615- F  | Speech Lang Path                          | Needs endorsement 4120, 4121, 4122 or 4123 for this course number   |
| 075-204         | Educator | 2811 BASC<br>CMPT<br>3005 Math<br>3205 Art<br>4005 Eng LA<br>4305 HDWT<br>4405 SPELL<br>4805 Dev. Rdg<br>6005 CATS<br>6905 Health<br>7005 Hist | NO CURENT<br>TEACHING<br>CERTIFICATE      | Renew professional teaching cert.<br>Expired 20070630   |
| 075-202         | Educator | 2610- Preschool  | Multi Subjects K-8                        | Needs endorsement 3601, 3602, 3603 or 3606  |

| School Location | Educator | WVEIS Assignment   | Current Certification                        | Correction Needed  |
|-----------------|----------|--|--|--|
| 075-201         | Educator | 3001-I through<br>3005-I<br>4001-4005-I<br>4401-4405I<br>4801-4805-I | SLD<br>Elem                                  | Correct 6 <sup>th</sup> digit code to reflect correct exceptionality or apply for permit for that exceptionality |
| 075-103         | Educator | 3606-3608 Gen<br>Music   | PE<br>French<br>Health                       | Needs Music or Elem. endorsement   |
|                 | Educator | 1451-0 PRSN<br>FINANCE   | Secretarial Studies<br>English<br>English LA | Needs endorsement 0400, 0419, 0600 or 0605   |
|                 | Educator | 6103 Adv<br>Human Anat<br>6301 Chm Tch                               | Gen Sci<br>Physics                           | Needs endorsements: 2600 AND 2700 or 2710 or 2800  |
| 075-102         | Educator | 4076-0<br>SPCH/ORL<br>COM  | English                                      | Needs one of the following endorsement codes 0800, 1001, 3100 or 3700  |
|                 | Educator | 3006-3008<br>3021<br>3041<br>3044<br>3045                            | Biology<br>Chemistry<br>General Science      | Needs Math Endorsement 5-AD  |
|                 | Educator | 3041-0 Alg   | SLD<br>MI<br>BD                              | Add correct exceptionality code in 6 <sup>th</sup> digit   |

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Progressing except for one issue.

The Team found only one violation of (W.Va. Code §18A-3-2 and WVBE Policy 5202). The following chart explains the certification issue the Team observed through a detailed review of the certified list, WVEIS Master Course Schedule, and the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) Certification Database.

|         |          |                                |      |   |
|---------|----------|--------------------------------|------|---|
| 075-103 | Educator | Physics 7-12<br>Gen. Sci. 7-12 | 6101 | Recode as 6022 and<br>needs Bio 9-Adult Permit<br>** Note: educator refuses<br>to apply** |
|---------|----------|--------------------------------|------|---|

Non-Highly Qualified Teachers as shown on the Schools' WVEIS Report.  
The following were listed in the school report on WVEIS as having not met the definition of highly qualified teachers (Chart 21).

Chart 21

| School                              | Subject                          | Name     |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|
| Beverly Elementary                  | MI/LD                            | Educator |
| Coalton Elementary                  | Self-contained. Reg. Ed.         | Educator |
| Elkins High                         | Spanish                          | Educator |
| Elkins Middle                       | Spanish                          | Educator |
|                                     | LD/MI                            | Educator |
|                                     | Music                            | Educator |
| Harman Elementary                   | LD                               | Educator |
|                                     | Spanish                          | Educator |
|                                     | Math                             | Educator |
| Homestead Elementary                | Reading/Lang. Arts               | Educator |
|                                     | Reading/Lang. Arts               | Educator |
| Pickens Elementary/<br>High School  | Reading/Lang. Arts<br>(Yearbook) | Educator |
|                                     | Music                            | Educator |
| Randolph County<br>Alternate Center | Geography                        | Educator |
|                                     | Social Studies                   | Educator |
|                                     | Art                              | Educator |
|                                     | Math                             | Educator |
| Tygarts Valley Middle/<br>High      | LD/MI                            | Educator |
|                                     | Spanish                          | Educator |

Noncompliance per West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5202

Randolph County had one employee hired on out-of-field authorization this school year 2007-08. This was not approved by the board as required by State Policy 5202, as the personnel certification coordinator and county superintendent were unaware of the requirement. This was not listed on the West Virginia Department of Education Professional Personnel Database.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Current data not available to review progress (2008-2009).

## Noncompliance Long-Term Substitute

Six substitute teachers were listed on the WVEIS list. Two individuals, were in long terms assignments (Spanish and LD/BD/MI/Visually Impaired, respectively) for more than 30 working days for which they were not certified. No waiver was requested from the West Virginia Department of Education as required by State Board Policy 5202. The Certification Officer did not know that was still a requirement.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Noncompliance**

As per the coordinator of certification, only four teachers were in long term assignments and all were certified or waivers had been requested. However, in speaking with the principal, the Team learned that a teacher had been in a vacant preschool position since August 26, 2008. The 30<sup>th</sup> day would have been October 8, 2008. When the Team asked the coordinator of certification about this situation and told her about the conversation with the principal, she said she didn't think the teacher had been there that long and she would write for a waiver that day.

## Coaches' Database

The Office of Education Performance Audits Training Manual states, "Using the Coaches' Database, check all coaches and athletic trainers to ensure they have been properly identified and hold the appropriate certification." The data base was created by the West Virginia Department of Education. However, as per the Randolph County personnel and certification coordinators, the county has never completed a Coaches' Database.

A random review of coaches and athletic trainers showed that they were certified. However, the county had five individuals whom they call "volunteer" coaches, who did not hold a valid coaching license. One individual recently completed the West Virginia Secondary Schools Athletics Commission (WVSSAC) training, but did not apply for a coaching authorization. A former coach held an expired coaching authorization (license). Others had taken and passed the SSAC training and held SSAC certificates. One "volunteer" coach had nothing on file. Both the personnel and certification coordinator believed that passing the SSAC training was all that was necessary to be a "volunteer" or non-paid coach. The certification coordinator stated that a "volunteer" could not get a coaching authorization from the West Virginia Department of Education because the position was not posted (The posting date is requested on the State application).

Note: The West Virginia Department of Education advises counties that they are not to have "volunteer" coaches and that any coach (paid or non-paid) must hold a valid license.

The following individuals, who hold an expired licenses or no license, have been approved by the Randolph County Board of Education. The coordinator of personnel stated the individuals have gone through the finger-print process.

- An educator held an expired temporary authorization, which was effective 10-26-94 – 06-30-95.
- The following successfully completed the WVSSAC Coaching Course:
  - An Individual - July 26, 2007
  - An Individual - March, 8, 2005
  - An Individual - August 8, 2005
  - An Individual - (Nothing on file for the individual)

Note: The Team reviewed the Educational Personnel Data Report, submitted to West Virginia Department of Education, in an effort to determine number of teachers hired on an out-of-field authorization, number of new teachers, positions not filled, etc. The report is to list the total positions posted for the year. However, the Randolph County’s report only listed 16.5 of its postings. This appeared to be a misunderstanding of how to complete the report and is another example why a professional staff member should have the responsibility of personnel.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

**Compliance**

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Partial Compliance**

The Coaching Database had been well-maintained and kept up-to-date. The Team did not find any certification issues. Only one instance was noted in which a teacher had not documented required training and verification of approval by the College Board to teach an advanced placement (AP) course.

**Randolph County- October 2009**

| <b>County-School</b> | <b>Educator Name</b> | <b>Courses/Content Teaching</b> | <b>Certification/Status</b> | <b>Findings</b>   | <b>Recommendations</b>   |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| 075-503              | Comment Educator     | 30311 AP Calculus               | Math certified              | No documentation of AP Training for Math and/or Verification of approval by College Board | Submit documentation of AP training and College Board approval |

## Recommendations

1. The Team recommended that the Randolph Central Office staff verify scheduled course (WVEIS coding) prior to completing the 2<sup>nd</sup> month report.
2. The Team recommended that when Randolph County Board of Education receives an application from an applicant, that the personnel director copy incomplete applications before sending them to the college or other institution for record keeping.

**7.6.3. Evaluation.** The county board adopts and implements an evaluation policy for professional and service personnel that is in accordance with W.Va. Code, West Virginia Board of Education policy, and county policy. (W. Va. Code §18A-2-12; Policy 5310; Policy 5314)

### Noncompliance

A review of personnel evaluations showed that signatures were often missing from forms and that timelines were not met according to W.Va. Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Noncompliance**

The Team reviewed a sampling of the personnel evaluations in each of the service personnel classifications (except maintenance where evaluations for all personnel were examined). Evaluations for all service personnel classifications, except bus operators and maintenance, were found to meet all policy requirements and timelines. The evaluations of all bus operators sampled had been completed for the 2007-2008 school year, signed by the employee in a timely manner, but had not been signed and dated by the evaluator. A review of evaluations for personnel employed in the maintenance department showed six of the nine maintenance personnel were last evaluated at the conclusion of the 2005-2006 school term (June and July 2006), two of the nine were last evaluated at the conclusion of the 2003-2004 school term, and one of the nine, who was employed in September 2007, had no evaluations.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

### **Service Personnel**

**Compliance.** The Education Performance Audit Team reviewed a sampling of 17 service personnel evaluations in each of the service personnel classification areas (Custodians – three, aides – three, mechanics – one, accountants – two, secretaries –

five, and cooks – three) and found that all service personnel evaluations reviewed met all requirements of the Randolph County Board of Education service personnel evaluation procedures.

Note: The service personnel evaluations were reviewed in relation to procedures for service personnel evaluations in place at the beginning of the 2008-2009 year. The Randolph County Board of Education adopted a policy March 2, 2009 on service personnel evaluations (Policy 4220), that changed some of the requirements contained in the procedures used for service personnel evaluations in the 2008-2009 year. This policy is effective for the 2009-2010 year.

The Team reviewed the following groups of **professional** evaluations with the listed results.

### **Superintendent**

The superintendent's evaluation was a short statement by the Randolph County Board of Education (RCBE). The RCBE **did not evaluate the superintendent's performance during the 2007-2008 year in accordance with a process and criteria authorized by Randolph County Schools Policy 1240, West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5309, and W.Va. Code §18-4-6.**

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The Team reviewed the superintendents' evaluation in process for the 2009-2010 year and found the board and superintendent had completed goal setting for this year (2009-10) and prepared a form showing the goals and the measuring standards for them during and at the end of the year.

### **School Administrators**

The Team reviewed evaluations for four randomly selected school level administrators (Assistant Principal, Elkins High School; Principal, Randolph County Technical Center; Principal, Harmon School; and Principal, Elkins High School). **The reviewed evaluations were completed during the 2007-2008 year and all timelines were met and all signatures were in place.**

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The Team reviewed evaluations of 14 school administrators and found all 2008-2009 evaluations had been completed and complied with the requirements of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5300.

### **Professional Support Personnel**

The Team reviewed three professional support personnel evaluations, School Nurse; Speech Pathologist; and Counselor, (Elkins High School). **Two of the evaluations were for the 2007-2008 year and all timelines and signature requirements were met.** The third evaluation was for a guidance counselor who was last evaluated on May 2, 2005. **The counselor is in the rotation to have an evaluation every three years and should have been evaluated in the 2007-2008 year. No evaluation for the 2007-08 year was found.**

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Noncompliance.** The Team reviewed 2008-2009 evaluations for nine professional support personnel with the following results: Two evaluations, speech pathologist and attendance director, met all policy requirements, b) four evaluations (counselor – Tygarts Valley High School, counselor – Elkins Middle School, counselor – Harmon School, counselor – North Elementary School) were evaluated on incorrect forms as professional support personnel are to be evaluated on “mutually established goals” with their supervisors, c) two Professional Support Personnel (school nurse – Elkins High School, Elkins Middle School, Preschool, and Technical Center and speech pathologist – Coalton Elementary School) who in accordance with the requirements of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5300 should be evaluated at least every three years were due to be evaluated in 2008-2009 and were not evaluated, and one person (athletic trainer – Elkins High School) did not have an evaluation for 2008-2009.

### **Central Office Administrators**

The Team reviewed three central office administrators were reviewed Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education, Director of Special Education, and Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education). **All evaluations reviewed for central office administrators met the policy requirements and timelines.**

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The Team reviewed evaluations for the 2008-2009 year for four central office administrators (Assistant Superintendent, Director of Child Nutrition, Director of Special Education, and Chief School Business Official). All the evaluations reviewed met the requirements of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5300 regarding evaluation of administrators.

### **Coaches**

**The Team reviewed 15 coaches’ evaluations. Twelve of the evaluations met all guidelines and timelines. Three of the evaluations did not meet all guidelines and timelines.** These three evaluations had the following errors and oversights: 1) one coach who was reviewed was not evaluated during the 2007-2008 year (the last

evaluation prior to the 2007-2008 year (Track – Tygarts Valley High School) and 2) two evaluations did not meet the time requirement that the evaluation be completed “within a four (4) week period at the conclusion of each sport’s season” (Girls Basketball – Harmon High School; Boys Basketball – Harmon High School).

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

### Partial Compliance

The Team reviewed 2008-2009 evaluations for 11 coaches with the following findings: Eight coaches (baseball – Elkins High School, assistant baseball – Tygarts Valley High School, softball – Elkins Middle School assistant football – Tygarts Valley High School, cross country Elkins High School, cheerleading – Tygarts Valley High School, girls basketball – Elkins Middle School, assistant football – Elkins High School) met all requirements of evaluations. Two of the coaches’ evaluations (boys basketball – Elkins High School and boys basketball – Harmon Elementary School) had not been completed and signed within four weeks of the conclusion of the sports season as required and one coach (golf – Tygarts Valley High School) did not have an evaluation for the 2008-2009 year.

### Teachers

The Team reviewed a sample of evaluations for the following teachers with the indicated findings (In most cases the observation forms were not available).

Teacher (3-5 years) Tygarts Valley Middle & High School. Evaluation for the 2007-2008 met all requirements except it **was not signed by the evaluator.**

Teacher (1-3 years) Elkins High School. First evaluation completed 10-24-07 – had three observations – okay. Second evaluation completed 6-5-08 – **NOTE the only item noted on the evaluation was a rating of “MS” [Meets Standard] on Professional Work Habits and a rating of “MS” on Technology Standards.** Both items had a note to “see observation” – had three observations.

Teacher (1-3 years) Elkins High School. First evaluation completed 10-26-08 – had three observations – okay. Second evaluation completed 6-5-08 – **NOTE: the only item noted on the evaluation was a rating of “MS” on Professional Work Habits** - had three observations.

Teacher (1-3 years) Coalton. **No 2007-08 evaluation.**

Teacher (1-3 years) Coalton. **No 2007-08 evaluation.**

Teacher (6+ years) Jennings Randolph Elementary.  
Evaluation – Professional Growth and Development Plan (PGDP).  
Evaluation completed and signed – October 1, 2008 – **Met requirements.**

Teacher (6+ years) North Elementary School.  
Evaluation – PGDP – completed 6-9-04 – **Met requirements.**

Teacher (6+years) Jennings Randolph Elementary School.  
Evaluation – PGDP – completed 5-15-06 – **Met requirements.**

Teacher (6+ years) Elkins Middle School.  
Evaluation – PGDP – completed 6-4-08 – **Met requirements.**

Teacher (4-5 years) Elkins Middle School/Tygarts Valley High School.  
**No evaluation found for 2007-08 year.** One observation for the 2007-08 year was found. The one observation was dated October 25, 2007, and the conference with the employee and evaluator was held on 11-16-07. This **did not meet the requirement for the number of observations per evaluation and the observation post conference did not meet the requirement that the conference be held within five days of the observation.**

Teacher (1-3 years) Elkins Middle School.  
The last evaluation found was for the 2006-2007 year and was dated 6-5-07. This evaluation had two observations dated 10-31-06 and 4-20-07. **The requirement of two evaluations with three observations per evaluation was not met in the 2006-2007 year. No evaluations were found for the 2007-2008 year. Two observations dated 12-4-07 and 1-9-08 were reviewed at the school. The evaluation requirement of two evaluations with three observations per evaluation was not met in the 2007-2008 year.**

Teacher (1-3 years) – Midland Elementary.  
**No evaluation was found for the 2007-2008 year.** Two observations dated 12-4-07 and 1-9-08 were found in the personnel file. **The 1-9-08 observation was not signed by the evaluator. The evaluation policy requirement of two evaluations with three observations per evaluation was not met.**

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

### **Partial Compliance**

The Team reviewed a sample of teacher evaluations containing at least one teacher from each school with the following results. Twenty of the 22 evaluations reviewed met all requirements of State Board Policy 5300 and Randolph County Board of Education Policy 3220. The evaluation for one teacher (Elkins Middle School) with one year of service did not meet the requirements of policy because the first observation had not been conducted by November 1 and the three observations for the second evaluation did not have a conference within five days of completion and were not signed timely. The first observation was completed 3-31-09 and signed 6-4-09, the second observation was completed 3-31-09 and signed 4-15-09, and the third observation was completed 5-

14-09 and signed 6-4-09, One teacher (Midland Elementary) employed July 16, 2007 did not have any evaluations.

## Summary

The Team asked the Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education to explain how the county office determined that evaluations were completed according to West Virginia Code and West Virginia Board of Education policy. It was stated that the principal turns the forms in during the checkout process. Due to the number of irregularities throughout the personnel classifications, the Team concluded that Randolph County was not exercising due diligence in assuring that the personnel, evaluation process was not being conducted per W.Va. Code, West Virginia Board of Education policy or Randolph County Board of Education policy.

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

### Progress

The evaluation process for all groups of personnel was much more organized with lists of personnel showing evaluation schedules and assignments. With the work and training completed, the school administrators in Randolph County Schools should be knowledgeable of the requirements of the West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5300 and Randolph County Board of Education 3220 regarding personnel evaluation. The monitoring system now in place should ensure all personnel are evaluated as required by policy. Randolph County will need to check professional support personnel evaluations, in particular, to assure all evaluations are completed according to West Virginia Code and State Board policy.

**7.6.4. Teacher and principal internship. The county board develops and implements a beginning teacher internship program and a beginning principal internship program that conform with W.Va. Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies. (W.Va. Code §18A-3-2b and 2d; Policy 5899; Policy 5900)**

### Noncompliance

According to the county's job description for the Mentor Teacher, the beginning teacher internship program did not meet the requirements of W.Va. Code and West Virginia Board of Education policy on beginning teacher internship program.

WV Code §18A-3-2b specifies that the beginning teacher internship program consist of several listed components including, §18A-3-2b (a) (4) "Mentor observation of the classroom teaching skills of the beginning teacher for at least one hour per week during the first half of the school year and which may be reduced at the discretion of the mentor

to biweekly meetings during the second half of the school year” and §18A-3-2b (a) (5) states “Weekly meetings between the mentor and the beginning teacher to discuss the performance of the beginning teacher and any needed improvements, which meetings may be reduced at the discretion of the mentor to biweekly meetings during the second half of the school year.”

The county submitted Policy 5900: Beginning Educator Internship Program as its county policy. In reference to components listed above, the county policy stated, “When possible, the mentor shall observe . . . at least one hour per week.” The job description for the Mentor Teacher reads, “The Mentor Teacher will participate in weekly (1<sup>st</sup> semester) and bi-monthly (second semester) meetings with the newly assigned teacher(s). Five of these should be observations and two of the five will be classroom observations. A written summary of all meetings will be expected.”

Randolph County must revise its county policy to comply with State Code and West Virginia Board of Education policy.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Partial Compliance; Partial Noncompliance**

A review of the Randolph County policy on the Beginning Educator Internship Program revealed the county policy now mirrors the West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5900 and is in full compliance with West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5900.

The county is in the process of rewriting the Mentor Teacher Job Description to ensure it is in full compliance with the new county policy and State Board Policy 5900. Duty #2 on the job description is being rewritten to say when possible the mentor shall observe the beginning teacher’s classroom teaching skills for at least one hour per week during the first half of the school year and at the discretion of the mentor change to one hour every two weeks during the second half of the school.

An additional duty will be added to the job description to say the mentor teacher will have weekly meetings with the beginning teacher to discuss performance of the beginning teacher and any needed improvements, and at the discretion of the mentor these meetings may be reduced to biweekly meetings during the second half of the year.

A copy of a training program for Beginning Teachers was made available for the Team members to review. A one-hour program is planned for each month through March 2009. The Team also reviewed a copy of the letter mailed to new employees.

#### **New Issue**

The individual school Teams checked at the schools to determine that a beginning teacher internship program and a beginning principal internship program were in place according to the W.Va. Code §18A-3-2b and 2d and West Virginia Board of Education

(WVBE) Policies 5899 and 5900. The Team found the following inconsistencies with State Code and WVBE policies:

1. Tygarts Valley High School. A new teacher did not have a mentor.
2. Elkins Middle School. Two teachers had a mentor. One of the teachers and the mentor met three to four times this year. One teacher and the mentor had not met this year.
3. George Ward Elementary. The new teacher had a mentor; however, the mentor had not received mentor training.
4. The principal at Pickens Elementary/High School and one of the assistant principals at Elkins Middle School did not have mentors. The mentor positions for these new principals had recently been posted with the posting ending October 7, 2008.

#### Summary Comments:

Prior to July 1, 2008, the responsibility of personnel was handled by two secretaries. The Director of Special Education was hired to include personnel in her current assignment, for which she is paid an additional \$500/month. Her title is Director of Special Education and Personnel. There is no job description for Director of Personnel.

It appeared that the personnel official believes that the two secretaries will be able to continue the work in personnel and that her responsibility will be to monitor the department.

It's evident that the new director of personnel has worked very hard in an attempt to correct noncompliance's in personnel. However, going into personnel with little knowledge of personnel other than reading the noncompliance's cited last year by OEPA, the director did not have a clear understanding as to how make corrections or to implement the hiring process as per school law.

The personnel official has made some positive changes, such as correcting the criteria listed on the matrices to make it reflect what is in school law, monitoring the absence of employees on workers' compensation, etc. However, she has made some changes that resulted in noncompliances. For example, the personnel official developed two different applications (one for new applicants and one for regular employees) to complete when applying for a posted position. The problem was when a new applicant was considered, along with a regularly employed individual, using the second set of criteria set forth in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a, the director or principal reviewing the application did not have the information needed for the person who had only completed the application for the "new" applicant, therefore, the new applicant was **not** evaluated fairly. For example, the second set of criteria asks for the total amount of teaching experience. The application used by the new applicant asks for the amount of teaching experience in the **subject area**. Reporting **only** the experience in the subject area, could short change the applicant and result in not being the applicant with the greatest amount of total experience when using the second set of criteria.

Years of experience listed on the application was taken at face value. Therefore if a teacher had worked as a substitute teacher for nine years and listed nine years of experience, it was accepted. One teacher who was hired listed eight years of teaching experience, yet a review of her personnel file noted that she was a substitute teacher for eight years, but five of those years she had less than 133 days and the total amount of teaching experience was less than four years. Another applicant could have truly had more than four years of experience and listed that on the application, yet the teacher who listed eight years would have won in that criterion.

The personnel official corrected (October 10, 2008) her revised application form to request number of days worked as a substitute, but it will still need to be checked for accuracy. The personnel office will prorate to determine amount of teaching experience.

Another error was to add an eighth criterion to the first set of criteria for substitute seniority. Counties cannot add additional criteria; however, the county can consider this in the sixth criteria as noted above.

Listing “examples” of or generic specialized training on the job description to meet the requirement of specialized training directly related to the performance of the job cannot meet the requirement in the second criteria which states specialized training directly related to the performance of the job.

Using **all relevant** specialized training to break a tie, and not give “regularly employed” applicants an opportunity to do that could result in not selecting the most qualified applicant.

Not being knowledgeable that subjects can be taught with different certifications has been a problem. An applicant certified in elementary education with an endorsement in reading, has not have been considered certified for a Title I reading position, yet Policy 5202 says it is a valid certification for this position.

Using the wrong matrix (second set) when no applicant meets the standards of the posting. Using the criteria for the first set (the correct criteria) could change the result of the most qualified candidate. The personnel director has knowledge of this now, and will correct this error.

The personnel official now holds two very important jobs; however, it appears that the responsibility of personnel is an add on that personnel will be, for the most part, monitored by her. Personnel is very important and often complicated. It involves more than “monitor” the work of secretaries. The work load is usually heavy and if not implemented correctly, it can be very costly to county boards of education.

**An individual is needed to oversee and implement the statutes of personnel as their primary responsibility.**

It is noted that the county superintendent of schools presented a position of Director of Personnel/Public Relations to the Randolph County Board of Education (RCBE). The RCBE did not accept this recommendation and the county superintendent stated that the Director of Special Education was the only county office staff member who would accept this additional assignment. The \$500 monthly salary for this assignment was not officially approved by the RCBE. This is another example of county administrator and Randolph County Board of Education action that deviates from proper administration.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

### **Compliance**

## **7.7. SAFE, DRUG FREE, VIOLENCE FREE, AND DISCIPLINED SCHOOLS.**

**7.7.2. Policy implementation.** The county and schools implement: a policy governing disciplinary procedures; a policy for grading consistent with student confidentiality; policies governing student due process rights and nondiscrimination; the Student Code of Conduct policy; the Racial, Sexual, Religious/Ethnic Harassment, and Violence policy; an approved policy on tobacco use; an approved policy on substance abuse; and an approved policy on AIDS Education. (W.Va. Code §18A-5-1 and §18-8-8; Policy 2421; Policy 2422.4; Policy 2422.5; Policy 4373; Policy 2515)

### Noncompliance

W.Va. Code §18A-1-12a (17) states, "All official and enforceable personnel policies of a county board must be written and made available to its employees."

Randolph County Schools has been working for approximately two years with a company to update their current policy manual.

The policy manual contained a cover sheet indicating the Randolph County Board of Education on April 2, 2007, rescinded all previous bylaws and policies. The Team met with the county superintendent and assistant superintendent and both reported they were still using policies from the "old" policy manual. If all previous policies were rescinded on April 2, 2007, then the "old policies" were no longer valid.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Overall Compliance**

Randolph County Schools has been taking corrective steps to ensure all policies are contained in the current policy manual. It was apparent during the progress review that only one policy manual was now being used. On May 20, 2008, the superintendent recommended to the Randolph County Board of Education to reinstate several policies that were missing or incomplete from the newly adopted policy manual on April 2, 2007. Since May 20, 2008 these "old" policies have been updated and placed or are in the process of being placed in their current policy manual. When placed in the manual and online, the policy has the date that the policy was adopted at the very bottom.

Additionally, Randolph County Schools worked with their policy company to review and update numerous policies over the summer, ensuring they are in compliance with West Virginia Board of Education policies and State Code.

One of the reinstated policies was Attendance – File IB. There may have been temporary duplication of the attendance policy as the current manual contains Policy 5200-Attendance. It would still be unclear which policy is the actual policy in effect. In speaking with the attendance director, she referenced policy 5200, not Policy File IB.

Adding to the confusion, on the attendance director's web page, there is a link to the Randolph County Attendance Policy. It is linked to Policy IB.

It should also be noted that Randolph County Schools has also worked on developing and implementing several administrative guidelines for implementation of policies. This is especially evident with the use of tobacco guidelines and procedures.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** Randolph County Schools continued to work with a company, NEOLA, to update and review local school system policies. An abundance of evidence verified that extensive work, time, and effort had been devoted to aligning policy manual with State policies. The Randolph County School's website contained a link to all policies.

The Randolph County Board of Education updated their attendance policy (Policy 5200) June 17, 2009 and again on September 8, 2009 (due to some minor adjustments to the State Attendance Policy). The attendance director's website has also been updated with a link to the new policy.

### **Missing or Incomplete Policies**

The Team reviewed the new Randolph County Policy Manual and found that the following policies were missing.

1. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 4373, Student Code of Conduct, indicates the minimum components that a county Student Code of Conduct policy should contain. Randolph County Schools Policy 5500 addressed Student Code of Conduct and Randolph County Schools Policy 5600 addressed student discipline. Neither county policy addressed the different levels of violations, investigation procedures, or reporting of violation procedures. In speaking to the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent, both indicated the levels of violations would be in all student handbooks. They also referenced their old policy manual, which as indicated above, has been rescinded. A review of the "old" policy did contain the necessary information. All student handbooks were not available for review. Some student handbooks did contain this information. This information regarding levels of student violations in student handbooks does not substitute for a county board approved policy.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

#### **Compliance**

Policy 5600 – Student Discipline is now in the policy manual and addresses the different levels of student discipline violations, investigation procedures, and the procedures for

reporting such violations. This policy was revised and approved by the Randolph County Board of Education August 4, 2008.

Several policies related to the discipline policy have also been reviewed, updated, and presented to the Randolph County Board of Education at the September 4, 2008 meeting. Such policies include Policy 4772 – Weapons; Policy 5610.04 Suspension of Bus Riding/Transportation Privileges.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** Evidence verified that policies continued to be updated and revised. The Team reviewed the Randolph County Policy Manual and verified that Policy 5600, Student Discipline, was reviewed and updated May 18, 2009; Policy 5610, Removal, Suspension, and Expulsion of Students, was adopted August 6, 2009, and Policy 5610.02, In School Suspension, was adopted July 23, 2009.

2. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5310 indicates that each county shall have, at a minimum, administrative procedures for implementation of such policy, subject to approval by the State Board of Education. Randolph County Schools' Policy 3220 addressed professional staff evaluations, but lacked specific administrative guidelines.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Compliance**

Randolph County Schools approved Policy 3220 – Evaluation of Classroom Teachers during the August 4, 2008 Randolph County Board of Education (RCBE) meeting. Randolph County Schools has also developed administrative procedures and guidelines for implementing Policy 3220. The administrative staff is continuing to review and finalize the administrative guidelines.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** Policy 3220 was reviewed and revised January 5, 2009.

3. Randolph County had not adopted a Leave Donation Policy as required by W.Va. Code §18A-4-10f. The superintendent indicated this policy was in the process in working with the company hired to update their policy manual.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Compliance**

The Leave Donation Policy was one of several old policies reinstated at the May 20, 2008 board meeting. It was further reviewed and updated at the September 2, 2008 Randolph County Board of Education meeting. Randolph County Schools Policy 3432.02, Personal Leave Donation, addressed professional staff and Policy 4332.02 addressed service staff.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Compliance.**

4. A Personal Leave Bank Policy was not located. According to W.Va. Code §18A-4-10, each county shall develop a personal leave bank. Randolph County Schools Policies 3320 and 4420 indicated that the county may create a personal leave bank.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Compliance**

Similar to the Leave Donation Policy, A Personal Leave Bank Policy, File GGA, was reinstated during the May 20, 2008 Randolph County Board of Education meeting. During the September 2, 2008 board meeting, it was further updated and reviewed. Policy 3432 addresses the sick leave bank for professional personnel and Policy 4432 addresses sick leave bank for service staff.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** Like the Leave Donation Policy, both Personal Leave Bank policies (3432 & 4432) were in use from their original adoption on September 2, 2009.

5. Federal Child Nutrition programs require each county to adopt a Wellness Policy. There did not seem to be a Wellness Policy in the Randolph County Policy Manual. The Child Nutrition Director was able to provide a copy of the Randolph County Wellness Policy. It was labeled Policy 8510. Another policy, Policy 8510, currently in the policy manual deals with the child nutrition standards. These inconsistencies created confusion and would be difficult for a county to apply/enforce.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Compliance**

At the September 2, 2008 Randolph County Board of Education (RCBE) meeting, the RCBE reapproved Policy 8510.1, Wellness, and included it in the policy manual.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The Randolph County Board of Education reviewed and updated their wellness policy August 6, 2009.

6. Randolph County School District Policies 3215, 4215, and 7434 addressed the use of tobacco on school grounds. Policy 3215 addressed use by professional personnel, Policy 4215 addressed use by service personnel, and Policy 7434 addressed tobacco use by outside agencies using school grounds. None of the policies addressed the appropriate interventions or enforcement steps. The Team recommended that the county develop a list of enforcement procedures to follow when an individual, especially school personnel, are caught using tobacco products. Also, there was no tobacco policy regarding student usage. The Team recommended that this policy be developed. Reference West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2422.5.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

### **Compliance**

Randolph County Schools added Policy 5512 to address the prohibition of tobacco usage by students. Randolph County Schools has outlined administrative interventions and enforcement steps for tobacco violations by students, staff members, and citizens. This administrative procedure and guideline is a comprehensive document and easy to follow.

## **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The Randolph County Board of Education reviewed and/or revised all tobacco related policies. Policies for professional and service personnel, along with student tobacco usage, were updated May 18, 2009. Tobacco usage by the general public was reviewed July 23, 2009.

7. A specific policy governing student substance abuse was located. The Randolph County School District Policy Manual Index indicated that Policy 5530 would be a policy on student drug prevention. Policy 5530 was not located in the policy manual.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The Team recommended that Randolph County conduct an audit of the new policy manual to include all statutory and West Virginia Board of Education policies. It may be beneficial to cross reference the previous policy manual to locate any missing or local policies that should be included in the new manual with someone assigned to oversee the process. The above list is not necessarily a complete list of policies that need to be added to the county policy manual.

#### **Compliance.**

Policy 5530 was placed on the August 4, 2008, Randolph County Board of Education agenda for review and approval. This policy does require that some additional administrative guidelines be developed. Randolph County Schools has also prepared their administrative guidelines, which include a preventive education program and steps to take if an overdose is evident.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Compliance**

##### **Other Policy Concerns**

8. Policy 5200. Attendance – The policy states, “At the beginning of each school year each school will submit a plan to encourage improved attendance to the County Attendance Director. This plan will include positive programs to be used and alternative plans that may be needed for chronic attendance problems.” (p.10). In speaking with the attendance director, the Team found that she was aware of this provision; however, schools do not submit plans to her. She indicated this plan would be outlined in each school’s handbook, which has been approved by the Randolph County Board of Education on an annual basis. The Team reviewed Elkins High School student handbook, online, and found no mention of positive attendance programs.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Noncompliance**

The Team reviewed the current Elkins High School student handbook online and found that the handbook does mention that “Elkins High School has an attendance incentive program consisting of rewards, prizes, certificates and privileges for students with good attendance. The complete program is posted on the school web page.” In reviewing

Elkins High School, the Team could not locate an incentive program. There were links to the county webpage and the county attendance director. The county attendance director's webpage contained a link to the old county attendance policy, Policy IB. Also, the personnel handbook located on the home page of Randolph County Schools referenced student attendance policy, Policy IB.

As indicated above, there did seem to be confusion about which attendance policy is in effect – Policy IB or Policy 5200. In speaking with the county attendance director, she indicated that Randolph County Schools is currently working on revising their attendance policy to be in full compliance with the recently update West Virginia Department of Education Attendance Policy 4110.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** A review of the current (2009-2010) Elkins High School student handbook online indicated that updates had been made to reflect State policy and Randolph County Schools policy. The Elkins High School handbook included an abridged version of the attendance policy and referenced the Randolph County School District Policy 5200. The Team reviewed some other school handbooks online and verified that attendance requirements were outlined and some school policies referenced the county policy. One exception was no attendance policy and or procedure was found in the Coalton Elementary handbook. This may not be a problem as long as students are informed on the procedure on an annual basis.

9. Elkins High School Handbook - Policy 5200 – Attendance – This policy allows students to make up their work, regardless if the absence is excused or unexcused. Students will be given the opportunity to make up missed work due to absences. “The student will have the same number of days s/he was absent to make up missed assignments” (p. 7). In reviewing Elkins High School handbook, it clearly states, “Make-up work is for Excused absences only.” This violated West Virginia Board of Education Policy 4110.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

#### **Compliance**

The above has been corrected in the 2008-09 Elkins High School Student Handbook. The Team reviewed the current handbook online and the provision that make up work is only for an excused absence had been removed.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** The Team reviewed several county schools', student handbooks online, including Elkins High School, and verified that all make up work requirements were consistent with West Virginia Board of Education policies and procedures. Student handbooks made mention of make up only for excused absences.

10. Elkins High School Handbook – In the handbook under attendance, Randolph County Policy IB was referenced, which is one of the “old” rescinded policies.

The Team recommended that schools review their student handbook manuals/policies to be in compliance with the new county policy manual.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

#### **Progress with Further Recommendations**

The following conclusions have been drawn from the review of the materials available.

1. Randolph County Schools has made an attempt to correct noncompliances and deficiencies in the area of county policies. Evidence was present to validate an effort being made to have all required policies. During the May 20, 2008 Randolph County Board of Education (RCBE) meeting, it was recommend and approved to reinstate several policies that were missing from the current policy manual. During the months of July and August, several policies had been reviewed and updated. On September 2, 2008 several of the reinstated policies had been reviewed and updated to the current policy format.
2. Randolph County Schools had developed a list of administrative procedures.
3. The Team reviewed the Randolph County Board of Education minutes for the May 20, 2008, July 17, 2008, August 4, 2008, and September 4, 2008 all the policy revisions were approved with one single motion. The minutes did not specify what policies were amended, approved, etc. The Team noted that other agenda items, such as out-of-state field trips and out-of-district attendance requests were approved by individual motions with detail. It should be considered that the specific policies be approved individually or at least, if approved as a batch, be specifically listed in the minutes.
4. Randolph County Schools should follow a systematic communication procedure of policy updates to school administrators. With the policy manual online, it would be very easy for policies to be changed and school administrators have no knowledge of the updates/changes. Changes and updates can be easily communicated through e-mail and/or during principal meetings.

5. Randolph County Schools is currently reviewing their attendance policy. With this revision, this should eliminate any confusion about which attendance policy is in effect. After the adoption of the attendance policy, officials will need to ensure all website information and school student handbooks are updated.
6. Maintaining the Randolph County Policy Manual will be a continuous operation. As State Code and West Virginia Department of Education policies are updated, county policies will also need to be updated.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

#### **Compliance.**

1. Evidence revealed that Randolph County Schools continued to update and revise policies as needed. Policies were reviewed periodically to assure they were consistent with State Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies. Immediate attention was given to policies that needed revisions due to the West Virginia Department of Education revision of State policies. This was demonstrated through the county's revision of the attendance policy September 2009.
2. The Team reviewed Randolph County Board of Education meeting minutes and found that all policies the board had reviewed, revised, or adopted were listed individually. This clarified when specific policies had been created or revised.
3. The central office leadership implemented a procedure to communicate policy changes to county office supervisors, directors, and school administrators. All staff were advised of county policy changes, updates, and the reason a policy had been updated through principals meetings and memoranda.

Updating the county policy manual will be a continuous operation to ensure policies are consistent with State Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies. Randolph County Schools demonstrated a commitment to timely policy updates.

## 7.8. LEADERSHIP.

### **7.8.1. Leadership. Leadership at the school district, school, and classroom levels is demonstrated by vision, school culture and instruction, management and environment, community, and professionalism. (Policy 5500.03)**

W.Va. Code §18A-2-12a (1) provides “The effective and efficient operation of the public schools depends upon the development of harmonious and cooperative relationships between county boards and school personnel.”

The Team found several areas that indicated effective “leadership” could be perceived as a problem in Randolph County Schools. Examples included the following:

1. According to interviews with the President of the Board of Education and county staff, the dropout rate was high and the graduation rate needed to be improved. However, neither of these areas was addressed in the county’s strategic plan. If these areas are not made priorities in the strategic plan, then it is not likely that the county will place the appropriate resources and energy necessary to improve them. It should be noted that the county’s attendance director makes monthly presentations to the Randolph County Board of Education. Still, these problem areas were not included in the board’s priorities.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The areas of dropout rate and graduation rate were not addressed in the Randolph County Five-Year Strategic Plan that was presented to the Team. The county performance in these two areas is better than the state average; therefore, it appears that no attention was given to them in the county plan. However, the dropout rate continued to increase and the graduation rate continued to decrease.

Interviews with Randolph County Board of Education members indicated that they are concerned about the dropout rate and the subsequent loss of revenue. The Board President indicated that a work session would be scheduled at an up-coming meeting to discuss the issue. Given this concern, it would be appropriate to address this in the county’s strategic plan.

The Superintendent of Randolph County Schools indicated that there was no problem with either area. She stated that both areas were within the State standard. She stated that she had not looked at the trend data and was not aware of the declining graduation rate or the increasing dropout rate.

An interview with the Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education revealed that his department was studying trend data and working with other high schools within RESA VII to discuss strategies for addressing these issues. He stated that he has made comparisons with other high schools within the RESA and is in the process of contacting them to see how they are dealing with these same issues.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** The superintendent and the assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction were making the county's student dropout rate and graduation rate a priority in the middle and high schools. Each potential dropout was interviewed to identify strategies to assist with high school graduation. Student dropout rates and intervention strategies were discussed at principals' meetings. Randolph County made tremendous strides in addressing this issue and the board of education members supported these strategies.

2. Budget is an issue. The county did not have an excess levy in effect at the time of the Education Performance Audit. Interviews and reviews of documents indicated a real need for additional instructional materials for classrooms and maintenance needs throughout the system. Examples of instructional materials included science textbooks at Elkins Middle School and courses available by technology at Harman Elementary/High, Tygarts Valley Middle/High, and Pickens Elementary/High School. Furthermore, technology at the outlying schools had not kept up with current technologies.

Regarding fiscal responsibility, the county board may need to consider staffing at the smaller schools and conduct an analysis to determine their feasibility. Without an excess levy the county has been forced to cut several positions. Many of these positions seem vital to the success of the school system. For example, there is no one professional administrator responsible for personnel. This fact has led to personnel practices that are not compliant with W.Va. Code and West Virginia Board of Education policy.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

The excess levy was defeated at the primary election by a narrow margin. The Randolph County Board of Education has not taken an official position on attempting it a second time. One reason given for the defeat and the reluctance to run the levy again attributed to the negative OEPA report. The Team sees this as an opportunity to use the report in a positive way.

The system had approximately \$800,000 as a carry-over from fiscal year 2008. Numerous maintenance issues and the issue of adequate textbooks still remained. Further review of school textbook inventories and orders processed from the central office showed that all requested textbooks were either filled from the county textbook depository or ordered and had been delivered to the school requesting the textbooks. Some textbooks appeared to be received 10/7/08 during the progress review.

During the interview with the county superintendent, it was reported that all secondary schools now have adequate technology resources to address the issue of virtual courses

in the high schools. It was further stated that all schools have the technology resources to implement the State's technology goals.

Neither the administration nor the Randolph County Board of Education has initiated the process of developing a long-range plan to address facility needs.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** All Randolph County Board of Education members stressed the importance of running the excess levy this school year (2009-2010). The superintendent was meeting with the various community groups to develop strategies for passing the levy. All board members supported this initiative.

The county superintendent has been active in the various communities in Randolph County, held public forums at various locations in the county, presented at numerous community organizations and agencies, communicated with the media, and involved local businesses in school system improvement. Randolph County Board of Education members stated that the county superintendent's emphasis on accountability at all levels was developing community confidence in the board of education. Board members stated that "tearing down old Elkins High School" is making people feel good about the school system and they are wanting school and school district improvement.

3. Another example of inadequate personnel administration is the issue of a certified principal at Pickens Elementary/High School. This year (2007-2008) there was a vacancy in the position and no one applied. The Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education was named the principal without application or board approval. A position for "lead teacher" was advertised without eliminating the position of principal. Through questioning, the Team learned that the teacher who accepted the position of lead teacher was actually eligible for a professional administrative permit. The Team suggested that the position be re-advertised, if the lead teacher applied for and received the position, then the county should seek a permit for the person. This would provide the school a principal onsite.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

This issue was corrected for the 2008-2009 school year with the employment of a one-half time teacher/one-half time principal at the school. This person is fully certified.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** No review warranted.

4. Another example of the need for a professional administrator of personnel activities is that the matrix used to determine the most qualified applicant for a position was not completed or not completed accurately.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

In August 2008, the current Director of Special Education was given the additional duties of personnel with a \$500 monthly supplement. Personnel procedures have been implemented to insure compliance with respective State Code and policy requirements.

Changes include:

- Matrix sheets for both sets of hiring criteria have been developed.
- Bid sheets for professional, service, and extra-curricular positions have been developed.
- A system of tracking advertised positions through Randolph County Board of Education action has been developed.

However, there is still considerable room for improvement in all areas of personnel administration. This person is performing two full-time jobs.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

#### **Partial Compliance**

This issue has been corrected through the county superintendent's reorganization of the central office. An assistant superintendent was assigned personnel responsibilities and was working diligently to learn the personnel process. The Team reported substantial improvements in personnel and only a few areas remained issues.

5. A review of Randolph County Board of Education meeting minutes showed several areas of concern. For example, signatures of the superintendent and board president were often stamped and not signed by the respective individuals. The superintendent's secretary controls the signature stamps.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The Randolph County Board of Education minutes had original signatures of both the county superintendent and the board president.

A review of minutes indicated that all information was not included in all motions. An example would be the action to assign the Special Education Director the added responsibility of Personnel Specialist/Director for one year. A stipend would be paid for the additional duties. However, no amount was specified in the minutes. The amount of \$500 was discussed but not indicated in the minutes. The Team believed that the Treasurer needed an official basis for using this as the person's pay since no amount was specified in the motion.

Minutes were reviewed for approval of the contract(s) with RESA VII for two positions, the math and reading coaches being paid by Title I. The contracts from RESA VII indicated salary but did not indicate the number of days. However, further review of the job descriptions indicated that each position is for 240 days. There was no record to indicate that these two positions went through an official hiring process at the county level or through the West Virginia Board of Education.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

Compliance. The Team reviewed the Randolph County Board of Education agendas and meeting minutes from July 1, 2009 through October 2009. The board minutes and agendas for each meeting revealed an organized format for conducting board meetings with “like” items grouped together. Board members stated that the new agenda format expedited the board meetings and more information was provided to the board. The Team noted a reduction in executive sessions and board members reported this was the result of the transparency and openness of the new agenda format and information provided by the county superintendent.

The employees hired through RESA VII were employed by Randolph County through the appropriate hiring procedures.

6. It was noted that when meetings were held with the schools’ local school improvement councils (LSICs), the LSIC reports were reportedly attached to the minutes. The Team member was unable to find them attached. Meetings were not conducted with each LSIC, rather the LSICs were grouped according to categories, i.e., community representatives, teachers, parents, etc., with each group meeting with one board member. After this meeting, each board member summarized the concerns of the particular group. This format did not satisfy the requirements of W.Va. Code §18-5-14.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The format of the local school improvement councils (LSICs) reporting to the Randolph County Board of Education has been changed and will now satisfy the requirements of W.Va. Code §18-5-14. The meetings with the LSICs of George Ward Elementary School and Tygarts Valley High School were scheduled for October 20, 2008 at Tygarts Valley High School.

During the interview with the Board President, he mentioned that he did not like this format and again indicated that he thought it was a waste of time.

The county superintendent indicated that the format would be compliant with the requirements in Code. She did further state that the system would still have combined meetings with certain groups from the respective schools, such as PTO Presidents, etc.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** No review warranted.

7. The Randolph County Board minutes indicated that several delegations made numerous appearances before the Randolph County Board of Education. Teachers at Elkins Middle Schools complained several times about the heat on the third floor of the school. It did not appear that the administration made any report back to the Randolph County Board of Education about the investigation into the problem or any relief that had been sought for the problem.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

In interviews with the board members it was stated that responding to delegations was a priority. They indicated that concerns were forwarded to the appropriate staff member for review. The respective staff member was then responsible for responding to the delegation and also reporting back to the board with an explanation of the resolution.

The Team verified this process through attendance at a board meeting and through interviews with staff members.

The county superintendent also indicated that a greater effort was being expended to respond to community requests in a timelier manner.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** Randolph County Board of Education members indicated that the superintendent thoroughly and efficiently responded to community issues. Members said that issues were handled before they evolved to the board level.

8. Also, another issue that was brought before the Randolph County Board of Education several times was the schedule change at the Pickens Elementary/High School. Again, no response or report was brought back to the Randolph County Board of Education by the administration.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

The situation has not been resolved; however, a grievance hearing was scheduled in mid-October. The county superintendent indicated that they attempted to resolve the issue through mediation; however, this attempt was unsuccessful. The teacher concerned in the issue refuses to “take a permit or go on an out of field authorization.” The Teacher was currently teaching one class without certification.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** The teacher was currently licensed for the assignment.

9. During the interview with the Randolph County Board of Education President, the Team member left with impression that this position of leadership was not being used as a positive influence. He thought the dropout problem was a concern; however, it was not in the strategic plan. The Randolph County Board of Education President also stated that he thought the LSIC reports were just gripe sessions. Again, this is an opportunity to develop a positive influence to improve instruction and develop support for placing an excess levy on the ballot.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

The Board President is in a position of leadership. He greatly influences several members of the Randolph County Board. During the meeting on Monday, October 6, 2008, the Board President was in charge of the meeting. At one point in the meeting he asked several staff members who were in attendance at the meeting what they were working on and progress they were making on numerous projects. This resembled an administrative staff meeting that would be conducted by the county superintendent.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** A board retreat was held July 2009 to discuss roles and responsibilities of the board and the superintendent. Board members, superintendent, and staff interviews indicated that the superintendent was providing leadership to the board and to the school system. The results were obvious as the Team read the board minutes and interviewed the board members. Leadership of the school system was no longer an issue. The board president conducted meetings effectively and efficiently.

10. The Board President also stated that he did not follow county policy when delegations appeared before the Randolph County Board of Education. He did not enforce Board policy and allowed delegations to seemingly talk without limit.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

This area seems to have been corrected. Interviews with Randolph County Board members indicated that delegations get five minutes to speak. The Team observed this at the board meeting on October 6, 2008. The Board President told the two speakers from the delegation that each of them had five minutes to speak. The speakers respected the time limits.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

#### Compliance

11. The Team noted that the Randolph County Board of Education's decisions and lack of action concerning school closure, such as a recent recommendation by the county superintendent, were made based on the community's reaction rather than the students' needs, school's condition, and county's fiscal resources.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

Although the issue listed above is not currently "on the table" several board members mentioned that a long-range facility management plan needed to be developed.

The county board member interviews indicated that the board members realize that there is a need to have an excess levy to adequately finance the system. Board members stated that there were no formal plans to run the levy again at this point in time. However, the superintendent indicated that a community group was in process of formulating plans to run the levy again and that a person(s) in the community is offering to assist or pay for a special election.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** Short range and long range facility management plans had been developed. The Randolph County Board of Education and the county superintendent were addressing the issue of an excess levy to adequately finance the system.

12. Randolph County Board of Education policies had been rescinded, but many were still being used. Schools policies that should have been aligned with the Randolph County Board of Education policy contained inconsistencies. This is a serious concern as policy making is the primary responsibility of the Randolph County Board of Education and ensuring that policies are carried out is the responsibility of the county superintendent.

### PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)

Considerable work has been done in converting old policies to a new format. On May 20, 2008, several old policies were readopted while the new policy changes were being formulated. At this time most policies had been revised. A staff member was assigned the task of completing the policy manual revision.

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

### Compliance

#### Summary

From interviews, review of documents, and observation, it appeared to the Team that the Randolph County Board of Education, primarily the Board President, is attempting to micro-manage the Randolph County School System. At the October 6, 2008 Randolph County Board of Education meeting, the Board President questioned staff members who were in attendance about what they had been doing the past couple of weeks and what progress was being made in several areas. This was done in the manner that the superintendent would do at an administrative staff meeting. The Board President proceeded to give direction to the staff members in a manner that the county superintendent should be doing.

The Board President also encourages persons with problems/issues to contact him rather than the central office. In conversations with county staff members this seemed to have been a historical problem. They feel that the Board President wants to solve everyone's' problems because they voted him in as a Board member.

There did not appear to be a coordinated effort between the Superintendent and the Board President. This situation cannot lend itself to the improvement and betterment of Randolph County Schools.

It did not appear that the superintendent serves in an advisory role that guides the Board in critical moments when leadership needs to be shown.

The county superintendent failed to initiate substantial corrective action to correct the OEPA findings from the initial Education Performance Audit. Many corrective measures had just been taken or were being taken during the week of the progress review (October 6-10, 2008). The lack of attention to facilities, finance, personnel, evaluations, and equalizing educational opportunities throughout Randolph County leads to a lack of priority in changing the internal administrative behaviors for corrective action. While, this report shows that some areas have been corrected, many serious issues remain unattended and new issues emerged. This equates to a lack of county leadership at the superintendent's level and at the Randolph County Board of Education level.

## PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)

**Compliance.** Randolph County Board of Education minutes indicated that the superintendent and board were working cooperatively and both entities understood and responded according to their statutory roles. The county superintendent provided the board weekly updates concerning data, expenditures, programs, and matters of importance. Board of Education members indicated that the board was more informed

about concerns arising in the school system. This eliminated the board's need to elicit information from central office staff during board meetings.

The superintendent systematically corrected the OEPA findings during the summer and fall of 2009. All Randolph County Board of Education members stated that the current superintendent accomplished more during the last five months than the county school district had accomplished during the past five years. The Randolph County Superintendent of Schools demonstrated strong leadership, established accountability, and demanded performance of all school system employees.

The Team noted that mutual respect existed between the Randolph County Board of Education and the county superintendent. Additionally, the central office staff and schools demonstrated a cooperative relationship.

The Randolph County Board of Education internalized the OEPA report from the October 2008 review and immediately set procedures in motion to transform the county school district. The board united and supported solutions to lead changes that demonstrated adherence to State Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies and improving the county's schools. This bold board action averted impending State intervention in the operation of the Randolph County School System. A Team member observed that the recent reviews and education performance audits of Randolph County Schools served as a prime example of the positive outcomes of a school system that responds to the Education Performance Audit reports. Pursuant to W. Va. Code §18-2E-5 and West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, the process provided a thorough review, identified problem areas, made recommendations, and provided an improvement period for the county. The process worked as designed and Randolph County Schools is getting healthy again.

## 8.1. INDICATORS OF EFFICIENCY.

### **8.1.3. Facilities. Schools are operated efficiently, economically, and without waste or duplication, and the number and location of schools efficiently serves the student population. (W.Va. Code §18-9D-15 and §18-9D-16 (d))**

Randolph has numerous facility effective and efficiency issues as detailed in the narrative under Regulatory Agency Reviews. Although costly items are prevalent regarding facilities, basic maintenance and cleaning would improve the health, safety, and aesthetics in many of the schools.

A few of the schools have principals, staff, and volunteers who have initiated a proactive approach to improve the schools' appearance and safety.

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Randolph County has corrected very few of the facility issues identified by the original Education Performance Audit Team.

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

##### **Progress**

Randolph County corrected the health and safety problems identified by the OEPA Team and performed basic school maintenance and cleaning that improved the schools' aesthetics and safety. A process was underway to demolish the old vacant Elkins High School which is an eyesore and presented safety concerns.

Costly facility items continued to be prevalent and Randolph County is severely limited in fiscal resources to improve the existing conditions. A roof or heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system (HVAC) replacement would devastate the school system's finances. Absence of an excess levy results in the inability of the county to perform essential building and equipment replacement.

### **8.1.4. Administrative practices. The school district assesses the assignment of administrative personnel to determine the degree managerial/administrative services provided schools establish and support high quality curriculum and instructional services.**

Within the central office structure, it appeared that the areas of curriculum and instruction were sufficiently staffed by three administrators. One of these individuals also serves as the principal at Pickens Elementary/High School which is addressed in other areas of this report.

A supervision gap existed in the area of personnel administration. Currently a secretary receives the applications, gathers the information from the applications, and submits them to the superintendent. No one is actually in charge of personnel. Numerous documents could not be provided and one person would say that another person had them, but the documents were never produced upon request by the Office of Education Performance Audit Team.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The central office structure was too loosely organized to support county and school improvement. Personnel administration is headed by an individual who has accepted these enormous responsibilities while holding the position of Director of Special Education. This dual assignment is unrealistic for two highly sensitive and legal areas. While the individual assigned personnel is working extremely hard, the issues identified in this progress report indicate continuous misunderstandings of personnel. Again, documents could not be produced and statutory procedures were not always followed.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

Compliance. The Randolph County superintendent reorganized the central office; established accountability throughout the school district; and approached solutions to county and school improvements internally, at the school district level, local levels, and State level. The West Virginia Department of Education System of Support was invaluable in the school system's improvement.

**8.1.5. Personnel. The school district assesses the assignment of personnel as based on West Virginia Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies to determine the degree to which instructional and support services provided to the schools establish and support high quality curriculum instructional services.**

Randolph County funds 9 professional and 3.86 service members with local funds outside the state aid formula. This does not include positions funded from Federal Funds, such as Title I and Title II. Two aides are funded through RESA VII, as well as two instructional coaches.

The loss of student enrollment in grades K-12 has been picked up with the addition of the Universal 4-Year Old Program resulting in little change in total student enrollment countywide.

All programs of study were offered in all schools according to the Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education and "there is equity among schools." The Team would disagree about courses provided in secondary schools other than

Elkins High School in which Advanced Placement (AP), honors, Dual Credit, career/technical, and others were lacking on-site or not delivered by Virtual School. Music and the required physical education were provided in all schools.

Smaller schools have combined grades, sometimes three grade levels, which impeded curriculum delivery.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The only change in programs of study was the availability of courses delivered by Virtual School. However, no students at Tygarts Valley High School, Pickens Elementary/High, or Harman Elementary/High School were taking advanced placement (AP) classes through Virtual School this semester. The county needs to pursue means to have courses on-site rather than have students travel to Elkins for Driver Education, AP and honors classes, and career/technical classes.

The smaller outlying schools continued to have combined grades.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** The county conducted a curriculum audit and reviewed school schedules, courses, and staffing to determine if all schools' curricular needs were being met. Programs of study were met through courses delivered by Virtual School for an advanced placement (AP) course at Pickens School and dual credit courses, and honors level courses at all high schools.

### **General Statement based on findings in the area of Personnel:**

**There is no professional staff member responsible for personnel in Randolph County.** A service personnel member, is coordinator of personnel/executive secretary, and states that she has total responsibility for personnel. However, she indicated that she does not participate in the final selection of personnel. It was evident, based on observations of personnel actions, that several procedures did not meet the requirements of W.Va. Code, State Board Policy 5202, or follow grievance decisions which provide interpretations of school law.

As per the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education; they are ultimately responsible for personnel; however, the job description for Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, did not list "Personnel" as a job responsibility. They did not refer to the assistant superintendent of elementary education as a person in charge of personnel.

The Superintendent readily admitted that both coordinators of certification and the Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education have little to no experience in

personnel and have little to no knowledge of personnel laws and State Board of Education policies regarding personnel. Observations of the hiring and licensure procedures of personnel found that several individuals work with personnel and with no one individual who was totally responsible and could discuss comprehensively the “big picture.” The Team needed to see several individuals to find an answer that should be known by an individual responsible for personnel. Noncompliances discovered in personnel during the on-site review were for the school year (2007-2008). However, it was evident, in interviews with the personnel staff, that these errors have been taking place, most likely over a long period of time.

Based upon several noncompliances listed in this report, the Team recommended Randolph County Schools employ or reassign a current county professional administrator as Personnel Director, who can spend a majority of his/her time in that area. (This is not an “add-on” for someone who already has a full schedule of work and responsibilities.) A professional employee, (Personnel Director), would be in addition to a Certification Officer and Personnel Secretary.

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

A professional staff member, Director of Special Education, has been assigned the responsibilities of personnel. This added assignment is not consistent with Randolph County’s need to systematize the personnel procedures.

#### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Progressing.** The Randolph County central office staff had been reorganized and another staff member was assigned the personnel responsibilities. Personnel procedures had improved and personnel procedures had been systemized.

## CAPACITY BUILDING

**18.1. Capacity building is a process for targeting resources strategically to improve the teaching and learning process. School and county electronic strategic improvement plan development is intended, in part, to provide mechanisms to target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process to improve student, school, and school system performance.**

**Randolph County School District has not demonstrated that resources have been targeted strategically to improve the learning process.**

**The county strategic plan failed to connect with the professional development plan, which was comprehensive, and the individual schools' plans. The county plan failed to consider specific systemwide weaknesses, specific schools, or grade levels.**

**A significant disparity in course opportunities existed in the outlying secondary schools. Distance learning and video conferencing equipment were absent in these schools to provide educational opportunities electronically. While funds for technology are provided by the State of West Virginia, most of these funds appeared to be concentrated in Elkins. According to the Digital Divide report, 48 percent of the computers were still using the Windows 98 operating systems. Technology is one way to equalize educational opportunities at the smaller secondary schools in Randolph County; however, the county has not utilized this resource to achieve curricular equity.**

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

The county strategic plan presented to the Team was the same as the professional development plan. While, the county superintendent stated that the strategic plan is aligned with the professional development plan, and indeed it is, Randolph County misunderstood the total long range guide on which to provide the county direction. All required plans including technology plan, Title I plan, special education plan, professional development plan, etc. are to be aligned with the core county plan.

As presented earlier in the report, it was noted during the review that textbooks were originally purchased during FY 08 using Step 7 funds, but the expenditure was later transferred to unrestricted funds. This had the effect of reducing the amount of unrestricted funds available while, at the same time, leaving a large unspent balance in the Step 7 project, which in turn reduced the amount of funds available for other instructional needs.

Randolph County School District still has not demonstrated that resources are targeted strategically to improve the learning process.

**PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2009)**

**Compliance.** Randolph County School District demonstrated the capacity for targeting resources strategically to improve the teaching and learning process as stated throughout this report.

## RANDOLPH COUNTY SUMMARY

The Education Performance Audit of the county school district practices in Randolph County revealed several issues directly related to student performance and providing a thorough system of education in an effective and efficient manner. The audit also revealed that several violations of W.Va. Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies have occurred.

Serious issues included:

1. Randolph County has not achieved AYP in five years.
2. Numerous schools in Randolph County exhibited health and safety issues, i.e., inoperable fire alarm systems, not handicapped accessible, general maintenance, deteriorating conditions, HVAC systems were long past their useful life, and many schools failed to provide facilities for 21st Century Learning Skills.
3. Finance audits noted some issues concerning Board fiscal procedures.
4. Personnel hiring, posting, and transfer practices were inconsistent with requirements.
5. Leadership. Role and functions of local board of education and superintendent leadership.

### **PROGRESS REVIEW (October 2008)**

Limited progress has occurred in Randolph County Schools since the initial on-site review. Policy issues have been corrected and a few facility, personnel, and other issues have been undertaken. Continuing and additional issues have been observed in personnel, finance, and facilities. Student achievement remains virtually unchanged and AYP status of the county and the number of schools not meeting AYP is unchanged. Leadership issues also continue to emerge to hinder progress in the system. A lack of diligence to applying laws and policies to practices in personnel and finance places the system in jeopardy. Among statutory indiscretions include noncompliance with W.Va. Codes §18A-3-2b (mentors); §18A-2-12 (evaluations); §18A-2-7 (hiring); 18A-2-2 (contracts).

Many school facilities need major repair and basic maintenance to secure the buildings for students and staff safety. Heating, ventilation and cooling systems in many schools need upgrading or replacement. Short range maintenance and long range facility upgrades are necessary to provide a thorough and efficient educational program.

In short, the system has serious problems that are interfering with the provision of the mandated thorough and efficient clause of the West Virginia Constitution. Conditions within the structure and operation of the Randolph County Schools are not ordinary.

Note: A recommendation on the approval status of the system will be made at the November 12, 2008 W.Va. Board of Education meeting or at the December meeting with other schools and school systems.

**Randolph County School District  
Approval Recommendation  
December 9, 2009**

The Randolph County School District has undergone monumental progress in correcting deficiencies that resulted in the West Virginia Board of Education placing the county on Nonapproval status December 2008. This progress is attributed to the following factors.

1. The Randolph County Board of Education responded decisively and immediately to the conditions listed in the OEPA report.
2. The county board hired an experienced individual for the Superintendent of Randolph County Schools to transform the county's educational system and correct the conditions that resulted in the Nonapproval status.
3. The Superintendent of Randolph County Schools reorganized and reassigned central office staff.
4. The West Virginia Department of Education System of School Support provided numerous hours and staff that assisted Randolph County. The Office of School Facilities has also contributed to correcting county facility deficiencies. The Randolph County Superintendent and board of education welcomed the West Virginia Department of Education support groups.

The OEPA Team reported that the Randolph County School System had corrected almost all of the deficiencies reported in the December 2008 progress report within a short time frame and was providing a thorough and efficient system of education.

As a result of major improvements in the county school system, the Office of Education Performance Audits recommended that the West Virginia Board of Education grant Randolph Full Approval status with the following provisions.

1. The OEPA conduct an Education Performance Audit, in the fall of 2010, of the deficiencies that had not been corrected.
2. The West Virginia Board of Education continue oversight for two years (December 2011) of the Randolph County School System to assure that the current improvements and progress are sustained and student performance increases.

Final Individual School reports follow the Randolph County Progress report. The OEPA recommended that the schools be granted the accreditation status listed in each school report.